DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 956 EA 010 152

TITLE	State Conference. Disruptive Youth. Conference Report.
INSTITUTION	Virginia State Dept. of Education, Richmond. Office for School Integration Services.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 75
NOTE	81p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *Delinquency; *Delinquency Causes; Delinquent Behavior; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Discipline Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Expulsion; Minority Groups; *Students; *Student School Relationship; Suspension
IDENTIFIERS	*Virginia

ABSTRACT

This report contains the keynote presentations and small-group discussion reports of the Virginia Conference on Disruptive Youth, sponsored by the Virginia State Department of Education. Keynote speeches covered such topics as the relationship between disruptive students and Virginia public schools, causes of delinquency, discipline measures (particularly suspension and expulsion), racial tension between black students and white students, and legal aspects of handling disruptive students. The small-group discussions focused on the community and disruptive youth, teacher preparation, inclusion of disruptive youth in school curricular and club activities, and student rights. An evaluation of the conference is also included. (Author/DS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147956

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

April 2-3, 1975

CONFERENCE REPORT

Technical Assistance Program
Office for School Integration Services
State Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

The Technical Assistance Program, Office for School Integration Services is funded under Title IV of The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, Section 403.

EA 010 152

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES STAFF

Dr. V. Wendell Hylton
Special Assistant

Mr. Shady Clark, Jr.
Assistant Supervisor

Mr. Charles L. McLeod
Assistant Supervisor for Minority Affairs

Dr. Jean A. Moorefield
Assistant Supervisor for Testing

Mr. Howard J. Ramagli, Jr.
Assistant Supervisor for Research and Dissemination

Mr. Horace P. Webb
Assistant Supervisor for Curriculum and Instruction

Mrs. Deborah W. Witcher
Consultant for Student Affairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Preface V

II. Introduction VI

III. Conference Evaluation I

IV. Keynote Presentations

A. Do Virginia Public Schools Contribute to the Disruptive Youth Problem 5
Mr. James B. Spurlock, Jr.

B. Disrupted Youth in the Public Schools 8
Mr. Leon Hall

C. Disruptive Youth: The Problem and the Challenge 11
Mr. George Guilliams

D. Project A.R.T.S. (Alternative Route to School) 16
Mr. Ferguson Meadows

E. State Conference on Disruptive Youth 17
Mr. Roy N. Puckett

F. State Conference on Disruptive Youth 20
Mr. Justin McNeill

V. Small Group Sessions

A. School Administrators in Relation to Disruptive Youth 27
Mr. James Anderson
Recorder's Notes, Mr. William M. Moore

B. Counseling and Psychological Services in Relation to Disruptive Youth 29
Dr. Rondle Edwards
Recorder's Notes, Mr. Clinton V. Turner

C. Disruptive Youth and School Clubs and Curricular Activities 30
Mr. Julian Moore
Recorder's Notes, Mr. Frank Cuthrell

D. Educational Implications of Teacher Training Programs 35
Dr. Jean A. Moorefield
Recorder's Notes, Mr. Thomas M. Lewis

E. The Community and Disruptive Youth 37
Mr. William A. Johnson
Recorder's Notes, Mr. Dale Robinson

F. The Changing Student Mores 40
Dr. Robert T. Frossard
Recorder's Notes, Mr. Ronnie G. Bognar

G. Disruptive Youth and Social Change 43
Dr. Boyd Bosma
Recorder's Notes, Mrs. Judith Whittemore

H. Disruptive Youth and Technology 46
Mr. William Vaughn
Recorder's Notes, Mr. John A. Brown

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

I. The School, Community and Student Rights 47
Dr. John Seyfarth
Recorder's Notes, Mr. Mack Benn

J. Federal Legislation Concerning the Disruptive Youth 50
Dr. Robert Turner
Recorder's Notes, Mrs. Josephine C. Baker

K. State Legislation Concerning the Disruptive Youth 51
Dr. David Alexander
Recorder's Notes, Mrs. Lois Bradley

L. The Juvenile Delinquent, Identification and Characteristics 52
Mrs. Carolyne Stevens
Recorder's Notes, Mr. Clyde Keen

VI. Appendices

A. Conference Program 59
B. List of Participants 63
C. Conference Evaluation Form and Summary Data 77

PREFACE

The State Conference on Disruptive Youth was held on April 2 and 3, 1975. This conference was a major step on the part of Virginia educators to look at the problems and concerns raised by disruptive youth in the Virginia public schools.

The conference participants considered and tried to answer many of the issues involving disruptive youth. We would like to thank each participant for his/her contribution to the overall success of the conference.

We would also like to thank those individuals who were participants on the program. Their contributions and expert knowledge were valuable assets in assisting with the smooth and effective execution of the program.

The wide range support shown at this conference clearly represents the concern and interest Virginia educators have regarding the best education possible for the youth of today.

In the final analysis, we hope that this conference report will provide helpful information to all educators as they move to continually improve the educational services for the children throughout the Commonwealth.

DR. V. WENDELL HYLTON
Special Assistant
Office of School Integration Services

INTRODUCTION

This report is a summary of the State Conference on Disruptive Youth held April 2 and 3, 1975 and sponsored by the Technical Assistance Program, Office for School Integration Services, State Department of Education, Richmond, Virginia.

Included in this report are keynote presentations and consultant presentations, as well as notes taken by the recorders in the small groups sessions. Also included is a brief summary of the conference evaluation.

The report is set up with the keynote presentations, in order of appearance on the program, and then the small group sessions, in order of appearance on the program. The conference program is found in Appendix A.

We hope that the information provided within will provide an accurate record of the conference for the participants and will provide others with an insight into the nature of and the issues concerning disruptive youth.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Sixty-two (62) of the conference participants completed the conference evaluation form. The participants' overall rating of the conference tended toward "helpful". The small group sessions in the Third General Assembly received the highest ratings of the participants.

Some of the *strengths* of the conference were:

1. Well organized.
2. Kept conference on time.
3. Small group discussions.
4. Regular and systematic reporting (out) from small groups.
5. Speakers knowledgeable in their field.
6. Well selected resource and consultant personnel.
7. Excellent cross section of speakers and persons attending.
8. Some specifics fom Montgomery County (slide presentation).

Some of the *weaknesses* of the conference were:

1. Too ethnic oriented.
2. Topic too broad (and too general).
3. Not enough specifics.
4. Too few solutions (techniques, methods).
5. Groups too large to really promote participation (interaction).
6. Too many lectures.
7. More time for group interaction.
8. Most of presentations did not deal with the stated topic and discussions did not either.

Of the comments and recommendations for future activities, the most outstanding comment was to conduct follow-up sessions on a regional or school division basis for teachers and administrators.

Some of the other comments and recommendations were:

1. Discuss more programs that might help deal with current disruptive youth such as alternative schools.
2. Include teachers, parents, community leaders, and students as participants.
3. More time allocated for small groups.
4. Reshuffle names for each small group session in order to have broader exposure to different thoughts from different people.
5. Do not schedule night session.
6. More presentations of programs being attempted.
7. Have a social hour.

KEYNOTE PRESENTATIONS

DO VIRGINIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS CONTRIBUTE TO THE DISRUPTIVE YOUTH PROBLEM?

PRESENTED BY:

JAMES B. SPURLOCK, JR.

Deputy Assistant—Governor's Cabinet

I am honored to be with you this afternoon to share with you one of the major problems facing public education—that being, the problem of dealing with "Disruptive Youth", or maybe a better term, "Unmotivated Youth" in our school systems.

Coupled with this problem, our public schools are also under attack by the so called "Lay Experts" who know exactly what is wrong with the way we do what we do. So, as one of these Lay Experts in the field of education, and/or administration, I feel highly qualified to tell you what's wrong with the public schools. To begin—

The teachers are afraid of the principals;
The principals are afraid of the superintendents;
The superintendents are afraid of the school boards;
The school boards are afraid of the parents;
The parents are afraid of the children; and
The children, heaven help us, are not afraid of anyone.

We are often the victims of the general public's tendency to find fault before finding out the facts. Many of us in this room are guilty of over-reacting before finding out the true story concerning our students. Many of us are not willing to make the necessary sacrifices to satisfy the curious minds of our youngsters. We are more apt to say—"When I was in school—I did what the teacher said without questioning it," even though it could have been wrong it is inevitable that change has taken place and will continue to take place in our society, but the acceleration of this change has caught most of us off guard.

I really do not need to tell you that the focus today is on youth, our children. We are witnessing a natural outgrowth of the child-centered culture our suburban-dominated society has cultivated so carefully in recent years. At the same time, we are witnessing widespread relaxation in the moral codes which have traditionally guided and placed civilizing restraints on our conduct.

I am disturbed by both of these trends. While placing our children in the driver's seat—figuratively, as well as literally—we have not given them any more attention, rather, we have given them less. In an ever increasing number of families, children are going out into the world with little, if any, home disciplines or self control. To make matters worse, our society seemingly has lost, or is losing, its moral sense of direction.

Either of these trends alone would leave us with our work cut out for us. Either would leave me standing here decrying the particular trend that besets us and gives you vivid descriptions of how juvenile delinquency is on the rise and how inadequate the existing juvenile and educational programs are in meeting this rise.

I realize it is not necessary for me to give specific examples of the effect that a lack of discipline has on a child, or the effect of an example set by an adult who has abandoned all pretense at moral uprightness.

I know you see all too often what I am talking about when you visit in the homes of emotionally disturbed or neglected students.

As an integral part of the educational system, and in your capacity as teachers and administrators, you are in a unique position to identify children with problems at a very early stage and to *assist* and not *brand* those children in the solution of their particular problems. In reality, I know it doesn't always work out that way. However, I

feel that parents, school administrators, and judicial authorities all have a tendency to forget the impact that the Elementary School has on the formative years of a child.

The Elementary School is usually the first public agency to deal with a child for any extended time each day. It is sometimes the first opportunity that the child has to learn to live and get along with his fellow pupils in a regimented environment. The importance of these early years and the significance of their impact on the life of the child cannot be overestimated. The educational process involves, as you know, more than the ABC's or academic training.

Not only is the school expected to instill good citizenship traits, but it is also expected to teach the social graces.

Most children entering kindergarten or the first grade are being exposed to their first real experience in social interaction. Their social progress, or lack of it, has a tremendous influence on their motivation and their desire to succeed.

The child who is unable to make friends with his peers, who is unable to obtain some kind of positive social recognition, who is unable to gain satisfaction from a sense of achievement, is headed for social or emotional problems that may later result in expulsion or voluntary dropping-out.

Ladies and gentlemen, I see a growing need to overhaul our present curriculum. It might be that too much emphasis is put on the needs of the teacher and too little on the needs of the student.

The inclusion of pre-vocational and industrial arts courses on the grade school level could also offer tremendous help to the academically retarded and the child who plans to quit school when he reaches age 16. I believe we must stop thumbing our noses at good vocational training courses in public schools. Rather, we should encourage some of our brighter boys and girls to pursue vocational courses.

It is a mistake to think that all of our more intellectually talented children should go to college. Further, it is a mistake to believe only the slower students should take vocational training.

A varied school program with something for everyone seems a logical expectation of a society that enforces a compulsory school attendance law.

A child in trouble is everybody's problem: the individual, the family, the community, and the state. And, I might add, in that order. There are many who would reverse the order and place the task of keeping a child out of trouble on the state first.

I do not subscribe to the idea that a juvenile and his family can be relieved of all responsibility for his action. There are far too many boys and girls in our society who have successfully weathered the forces of discrimination poverty, illness, lack of recreational facilities, and the many other norms that are demanded of them today.

There are many of us today who would not like our children to have to be subjected to the same forces during their youth as we endured. Yet, we must agree, the individual must shoulder responsibility for his own actions.

We need only to look at the adult world to see a reflection of the youth today. We see a decline in respect for anyone in authority, for rules and regulations, and laws that have been a part of our national development.

During this period of progress and affluence in this nation, there is no further *need for each other.*

We work so that we can enjoy life.

We strain to make *things* easier for us.

We have become complacent. The adult has become bored.

We can look at our youth and we can easily see a reflection.

Whether it will be acknowledged or not, the forces of the community that historically have kept the youth in check are rapidly being cast aside. Here, I refer to the discipline by the parents, the fear

and respect of the police, the respect and interest in the school, the definite belief in the past as to what is right and wrong, and the need for the youth to be gainfully employed. These factors are no longer being accepted.

It is not enough to talk about what is wrong. I fear we do too much talking about what is *not* being done and too little about what can be done.

I would like to give you several suggestions as to where emphasis might be placed in an effort to curb the problem of disruptive youth and restore faith in our public schools:

1. A more strict criteria for selection of administrators and teachers.
2. Citizenship, history, not black or white—but American history, discipline, and respect should be placed back into the curriculum of the youth.
3. The young people of today must be treated as young people, not as mature adults. There must be constructive ways of self-expression and self-development, and tolerance for self-initiative. With these, also instruction, discipline, and sound direction.
4. There must be more coordination and cooperation between school personnel, parents and students. Our society is geared toward providing programs for youth.
5. Give teachers key decision-making responsibility to allow them to affect the operations of the school on a daily basis.
6. Youth must be made to realize that education is more than academic achievement, that self-maintenance and a sense of responsibility are also necessary.

Now we come to the question posed by the topic of this talk: Do Virginia Public Schools Contribute to the Disruptive Youth Problem?

When a school expels a child and forces him to make his own way on the street, they are without a doubt contributing to any subsequent delinquency in which that child becomes involved.

When a school permits a child to drop out without special counselling, they are reducing to near zero the chances of that child staying out of trouble.

It would, of course, be unfair to say the school creates delinquents. It would be more appropriate to say the school, along with other community forces, the family, and the child himself, are responsible for the delinquent's behavior.

Who is to blame is not nearly so much to the point as what our schools are now doing and plan to do to curb the problem of "Disruptive Youth".

The emphasis must be on prevention, on good family and parental attitude, on useful occupation of the youth's time and talent. Let us hope that as much energy can be spent by the adults in placing constructive challenges before our youth as is spent in trying to fulfill the many material needs. If we cannot adequately solve this problem, the future appears bleak.

Thank you. . . .

DISRUPTED YOUTH IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PRESENTED BY:

LEON HALL

Southern Regional Council

Alexander Pope said: "Tis education forms the common mind: just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined". In America today, the classroom is at the top of the list in public institutions which set social, ethical and intellectual standards by which human twigs are bent. It is also the field in which the seeds of social, ethical and racial ferment are most brutally sown. What happens to a young life in the classroom often foretells what will happen to it in the streets.

With the advent of serious attempts to dismantle dual school systems in the South, drastic repercussions have effected a new brand of student: the PUSHOUT—the student who leaves school because of discriminatory treatment or arbitrary actions of school authorities, or as a result of general alienation and hostility.

In an effort to curtail desegregation efforts on the part of the federal government and indigent community groups, and . . . based on tragic insensitivity many public school administrators, counselors, teachers and coaches have dealt with complex changes and problems—real and imaginary —by invoking absolute standards of law and order. These are arbitrary and severe rules and regulations by which they cut off young people from completing elementary and secondary education—often pemanently. These young people are different from the DROPOUTS who, for many reasons leave school, often, because they *just don't* want to be in school. A vast majority of the pushouts, I have encountered, genuinely *want to be in school.* But the emotional pressures, racial hostilities shown by other students, educators, coaches, counselors and general alienation—overt and subtle—drive them away. Consider the following statement from a young lady in high school: "I think it's unfair for a student to be expelled from school for being tardy, because a lot is going on in school these days and when you're absent, you miss a lot. I think you should be given something to write or maybe stay after school. A certain incident occurred this year between a black and white student. They were fighting. The black student was expelled, but not the white. The black had to appear in court. This is unfair. In class, the white comes first. It's hard to get along sometimes". Interestingly, a small percentage of teachers are responsible for an overwhelming percentage of those out of school. As in Florida, the Governor's Task Force found that 4 or 5 teachers accounted for over 80% of the referrals for suspension and expulsions in the average school system.

In not so surprising numbers, the majority of these young people are racial minorities, varying in their academic performance and sex, varying in their family backgrounds. But, more times than not, they are male and from low-income families, and have rebelled against mistreatments real or perceived. These young blacks who are cut off from the classroom are most often found in predominantly white schools or classrooms. PUSHOUTS are not so prevalent in majority-black schools or in classrooms where the teacher is black —a fact borne out in testimony by Dr. Scott Kester, an educational psychologist from the University of Miami at Coral Gables, when he stated that he had found "black students attending predominantly white Dallas, Texas schools had a suspension rate 600 per cent higher than black students attending predominantly black Dallas schools." This was due, he said, to probable racial bias in the school district's disciplinary procedures and to the greater frequency with which black students participated in behavior which was considered disruptive. These conclusions were borne out further with unprecedented candor when Dallas school superintendent Nolan Estes testified that racial prejudice exists in the Dallas schools and that "institutional racism" contributed to a larger number of blacks than whites being suspended from classes.

One may ask how these students are pressured out into the streets and away from the learning tree. The answers are not so obvious, but . . . the most vicious weapons being used to bar these students

from enjoying equal access to education are not their poverty, nor their intellectual capacities. Rather, suspensions and expulsions are the tools most often wielded by sometimes racist and insensitive school personnel. In many states throughout the South, these suspensions can be indefinite, vocally invoked, "Go home . . . until we send for you", and often never entered into a school's official records.

Over the past 4 school years, throughout America, black and minority students have been evicted from public schools at a national rate of 2 times that of white students thru suspensions and expulsions: 6% of blacks—3% of whites.

In school year 72-73, in 2,908 school districts, representing about half of the 50 million elementary and secondary students nationwide but including 90% of all minority students . . . 42% of those suspended and 37% of those expelled were black, contrasted with a total black student population of 27%. Also black students are banned from school longer; nationally the figures are 4.5 days for blacks and 3.5 days for whites.

In school year 72-73 here in your state, the same trends were present. 46% of those suspended and 43% of those expelled were black. While your total number of *reported* expulsions (1,999) was quite low, the black percentage of those expelled in cities was astoundingly high—74% (41.8% of all black students in cities). All of this contrasted with the fact black students represent only 24.2% of your total student population. Also, black students lost an average of 3.80 days or almost 4 days whereas white students lost an average of 2.98 or nearly 3 days because of suspensions. According to the excellent "racial and ethnic" survey by your State Department's Technical Assistance Center.

Here, in Virginia, if a child is picked up for what seems to be truancy (and with no requirement to report his absenteeism to a central authority by the school) the parent can be charged with a misdemeanor and the child can be institutionalized.

In Virginia, the only acceptable exemptions from the statutory compulsory attendance laws are students who live great distances from a school system; those with physical, mental or emotional disabilities; conscientious objection by their parents; and those deemed unable to profit from further schooling. There is no exemption for being pushed out of school.

PUSHOUTS in a number of those cases which are actually reported, have violated relatively minor school codes including speaking out of turn, talking smart, laughing in class, and wearing clothing not suitable to the codes of the school—styles most often introduced by blacks, like the Afro-hair, bellbottomed pants, and platform shoes.

The State of Virginia is required to provide free textbooks for indigents through grade 12, and students who forget to bring them to class can be expelled.

One of the tragic effects of these procedures and policies is that those who could benefit most from the certification and vocational mobility that education engenders—the black and the poor—are quite literally pushed out of the educational system before finishing high school. At the very least, they are discouraged from pursuing formal education in any form because of the hostility and stifling atmosphere they associate with it.

While this kind of treatment falls with a heavier hand on black students, the arbitrariness and severity of disciplinary procedures affects white students too. A white student in Florida recounted this tale:

> "I have been suspended on two occasions for reasons that were not true (a dress code violation, a demonstration and forging a hall pass). I feel that if a student gets in trouble once, he better look out, because administrators hold grudges. They suspended me on a description given by the teacher to the dean. But they would not let the teacher come to the hearing to identify me by face. I also knew who the teacher was. When I requested that he be there, the dean told me to 'shut up'."

There are, of course, in any group, those students who cannot conform to the mores of that group, whether racially different or the same. These are not what I call PUSHOUTS. The pressure to which they yield are not particularly racial.

Additionally, intelligence tests, sometimes racially or socio-economically biased, tend to push minority students into classroom situations where they feel they don't belong. Without careful research, students are placed in remedial courses, classes which are more often than not predominantly black and minority.

Without federal sanction to openly discriminate in setting up classroom situations, these covert rites are carried out like some fiendish and diabolical ceremony on unsuspecting victims. The resulting number of black students sacrificed has increased disproportionately to the rate of white students in the few years since desegregation efforts have been stepped up.

Hostilities by school administrators are carried beyond the classroom per se. Black students are excluded from extra-curricular activities. They are condescended to or ignored in street situations; and in Virginia as in many other states, corporal punishment is permitted, but blacks are disciplined in more extreme and racially-slanted manners. Counselors are not racially balanced, and therefore black students are forced to internalize problems concerning the school. With increased displacement of black educators, these students are left without a significant number and variety of positive black models outside the home.

To complicate things, the pushout phenomenon places countless thousands of young people in immediate danger of being labeled "delinquent" simply because their primary institutional affiliation is disrupted; no other is provided in its place. Interestingly, there is a significant drop in the number of young people who actually engage in delinquent behaviors subsequent to their expulsion from school, even though the black pushout often becomes the very thing with which society has branded his ethnic group: criminal, unwed mother, junkie, welfare case, or just "another somebody we have to waste our tax dollars on."

In the transition between high school and adulthood, there is a bottleneck through which black students must travel. In the United States more than half of black students enrolled in predominantly white high schools are diverted by means of pushout into vocational institutions or premature adulthood.

Whenever a minority student is pushed out of school, the quality of our national life drops accordingly. And, while a direct correlation between lack of educational attainment and incidence of juvenile delinquency has never been fully documented, it is reasonable to assume that pushouts and dropouts will likely turn to a more practical school—the street—if they are discouraged from pursuing conventional educational goals. Two high priests of progressive education, Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, advanced this theory in their book *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, in which they state that:

> "These 'failures' do not disappear. They remain in the community, and they comprise an endless and growing population dedicated to 'getting even' with the society which has reviled and rejected them in the school. The cost—just in dollars—we pay for dealing with these drop- or pushouts far exceeds virtually *whatever* cost would be entailed in modifying the school environment so as to produce attitudes and skills in these young people that would help them to become participating and contributing members of the community rather than its enemies."

What is *most ironic*—a bitter fact—is that the very educators who produce or force pushouts are blind to the vicious cycle which they in fact will eventually fall victim to in the end. These educators who feel the need to arbitrarily purge the school systems of racial differences will be also purging the school systems of their own jobs and positions. For with the devastating decrease in the number of students, there will be a decrease in the number of educators needed. The ratio of teachers to students will not be improved, just eliminated in some cases. The fewer the students, the smaller the allocations for supplies (hence, poor quality and fewer); salaries will be non-negotiable because the demand for teachers will become stagnant. It will indeed be society which suffers at the hand of the pushout in the long run, but educators must realize that in between the hurt feelings of pushouts and their families comes the vacant *positions* where there is no need.

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH: THE PROBLEM AND THE CHALLENGE

PRESENTED BY:

GEORGE GUILLIAMS

Special Programs Coordinator

Montgomery County Schools

It is a pleasure for me to have an opportunity to speak to you on this occasion; but it does not please me to know that disruptive youth have created such conditions in our society as to make such a speech necessary. However, the fact remains that such conditions do exist, and we must accept them as reality and plan programs to counteract this growing trend of disruptive activity among our youth.

The Southern Regional Council and the Robert E. Kennedy Memorial's Publication *The Student Pushout*, defines disruptive youth as "those young people who have been expelled or suspended from school or who, because of intolerable hostility directed against them, finally quit school".

Records show that in the 1973-74 school year there were 21,564 school age residents of Virginia who were not in school. This is an increase of 360 over the previous school year. This group represents drop-outs, truants, and other students not in school for any reason. When we look at the specific reasons for students not being in school, we find those suspended, which means they are probably out of school for a short period of time, reached 45,329 for the school year 1973-1974. The break-down shows that 38% of these pupils were from counties and 53% were from cities. And to look at another group, the expelled students, we find that there were 307 expelled during the year 1973-74. Of this number 162 were county students and the cities accounted for only 145.

During the same year, 21,025 students dropped out of school which represented 5.2% of the total membership. Another interesting fact is that behavior problems were listed as the reason for droping out in 4,558 cases.

Taking all these statistics into consideration, it is apparent that, for any given year, less than 5% of the youth in our country are considered as disruptive or delinquent; thus we should in no way categorize all youth as such, based upon the actions of this small minority.

We have suddenly become aware of the problem with disruptive youth in the Commonwealth, but I believe that, if we look closely, we will see that this problem has not developed overnight. And it is also true that the problem will not disappear miraculously.

There are several factors that I want to mention, that, in my opinion, have contributed to the problems among the youth of this generation.

1. In 1942, during World War II, the draft suddenly removed the majority of our young men, ages 18-24, from our society and placed them in the armed services. This left those boys under 18 years of age at home, who up to this time, had fathers, older brothers, and friends to look to. Then, they experienced instant maturity; by this I mean they became the leaders as they were the oldest boys left at home. So it can be said that they may have lost several years out of their "growing up" period as a result of World War II they could no longer depend upon older boys as they had in the past; they suddenly found themselves in the "driver's seat". Now, thirty years later, these boys are the parents of many of our youth today, and I believe that to some degree this deviation from normal development during their critical years adversely affects the situation today.

2. In many instances today, parents fail to give their children the guidance and provide the parental control which are vitally needed for normal development. This factor may be directly related

to the one previously mentioned, but I believe that it is important enough to emphasize as a separate condition affecting our youth. To me, one important purpose of parents in a home is to guide children until they have reached a stage of maturity in which they are capable of guiding themselves. This stage is not one which the child can determine for himself, but one that must be earned. For a child to be given this freedom he should prove that he has reached a point in life where he can, and will, make wise decisions and be willing to assume the responsibility for those decisions. I believe that today this parental guidance and control are released too soon, and too many children are allowed to make vital decisions when they are neither willing nor capable of assuming the consequences.

3. It has been said that our world's knowledge doubles every ten years. It seems that the youths' knowledge of laws, prosecution techniques, and judicial policies have increased to the extent that they can predict many outcomes of court cases even before they have committed the offense. So by playing the odds, many are willing to commit delinquent acts up to the point where they believe that the punishment will be just short of a jail sentence. I have heard of youth disussing this issue on several occasions. Thus we may repeat a statement made long ago that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing".

4. There is a different value placed on children today from that of a generation or two ago. During the early part of this century, a child was an asset to a family because most of the family income came from farms or related labor. Available labor was a premium for any farm family, and each child could well pay his own way in the production of marketable products. But today, when less than 5% of our population live on farms and the need for children for farm labor has almost vanished, the value that many parents place on their children has gone down proportionately. This means that children today have become a liability to many families while in the early days of our history they were an asset.

5. We often tend to treat symptoms instead of the disease. Disruptive behavior, extensive use of drugs, stealing, and other deviant behaviors are symptoms of problems but are not problems themselves. I could go on and on and mention other things which we often consider to be problems with youth when actually they are only indications of some deeper need that is not readily apparent. The real problem with most disruptive youth, if not all, is immaturity. I believe that today's youth mature more slowly than they did a generation ago. I say this even though youth of today have more knowledge than those of the previous generation, but knowledge is not maturity. Today's youth have more life's experiences than those of early years, but experience is not maturity either. They also have more freedom than they have had before, but then again, having freedom is not maturity. Knowledge is something for us to use; experiences are something to help us grow; and freedom is something that is of little value unless it is accompanied by responsible actions.

The accumulation of knowledge with an understanding of how it affects the individual who has it and how it can be used for the good of all is the birth of maturity. The understanding of common every day experiences, as they relate to one's self as well as to others, is food for the maturing process. Many unusual experiences must be interpreted for us by someone whom we respect before they can become meaningful to us and before we can understand how they relate to others. Youth must understand freedom as an ingredient that must be earned by proving that they are capable of using it without violating the rights of others. Freedom implies responsible action on the part of each individual with a deep regard for his relationships with those about him. Thus, if a youth has knowledge without understanding, experiences without proper interpretation, and freedom without responsibility, the maturing process is slow in developing. But if this youth lives in an environment where he has understanding of the knowledge that he has received, someone whom he respects to help interpret life's experiences, and parents who teach responsibility, then he is likely to mature more quickly. I recently heard of a retired police chief who said, "The only cure for delinquency is maturity". I am inclined to agree.

6. Up to now I have talked about factors that have a *direct* influence upon delinquent youth in our community. At this time I want to mention one factor which is not linked directly to youth, but it affects them in an indirect way. This has to do with how adults look at the actions and attitudes of youth and how they relate to them.

First of all, we need not extend the word delinquent to all silly pranks that youth do, even when they backfire. Most youngsters get involved in

something like youthful mischief at one time or another. Some of it may be harmless. As long as things go well and nothing results from these pranks, even adults sometimes consider them to be funny, but when they backfire and the result is more damaging than anticipated, then a different perspective develops. Again, it is common, if not normal, for parents and teachers to class children's acts as delinquent or disruptive based upon their own feelings at the time, upon their own likes or dislikes, or according to their standards as to what acceptable conduct should be. We must remember that youth are youth and we can make nothing else out of them nor should we want to. Time will take care of that soon enough.

I have mentioned several factors that affect the normal development of our youth. Now let us look at some of the characteristics of disruptive or delinquent youth as they relate to our school systems, to the community, and to society. First let me say that disruptive youth come in all shapes, sizes, and colors. They come from all sections of our country and from every economic stratum. When they are children, it is hard to predict what direction they will take when they become teenagers. Thus parrents and teachers must constantly be on their guard to watch for problem signs and have a definite, positive plan of action to help correct them as they appear.

Some of the most obvious characteristics of disruptive youth are the lack of educational motivation, the need for personal attention, the lack of long-term goals, and the failure to mature socially. The administrators and teachers of Montgomery County Schools have considered these characteristics in the light of students and visualized a situation that would help overcome these disadvantages. The school division has been fortunate in securing some funds from the Department of Justice and Crime Prevention to start a program which we call ARTS, which means Alternate Route to School. In this program youth who are expelled from school or those who give indications that they will be expelled are placed in a unique educational situation, provided a different curriculum, and taught using different techniques from those in regular school. An attempt is made to provide an individualized program that will deal with the needs of each student with the help of three counselors who work with the students in the academic, social, and vocational fields. Seventeen boys and girls from the Montgomery County Schools are being served in this program at this time.

The primary objective is to take delinquent youth, enroll them in a special training situation designed to meet their specific needs, and thereby prevent them from committing additional undesirable acts or having further court involvement. The secondary objectives are to help them improve in social adjustment, to assist them in planning for a career in the world of work, to provide on-the-job training for those who qualify, to help develop the job skills needed for full-time employment after leaving school, and to assist these students to advance academically.

The procedures for selecting participants are as follows: (1) If this individual is still enrolled in school, a referral will be made by the probation department after consuting with the high school principal and/or the project director, who is also the visiting teacher. If the individual is not enrolled in school, the probation department will make referral to the project director or counselor. (2) The project director and the probation department will collect all relevant information about the subject and present the proposal to the project selection committee. This committee consists of a probation officer, the visiting teacher, a school psychologist, a school principal, a member of the school board, and the project head counselor. They will decide whether an individual should be admitted to the project, using the following as a basis of judgment: age, severity of the offenses committed, behavior pattern, apparent attitude toward educational training, space available in the program, and general chances of the subject's achieving positive results. (3) The project staff will then administer diagnostic tests and, with the student, plan an individualized prescribed program of training with specific training goals. The head counselor for Project ARTS will, following this presentation, give you a detailed picture of the activities that are carried on with this group of students.

There were 23 students enrolled at one time or another during the first year of the program; 14 completed the school year and advanced to the next academic grade. Of these 14 students, who completed the year, only 4 had not had previous court contact. Thus, most of the students who enroll in this program have been envolved with the courts or with the probation department. The staff members felt that, even though most of these students are already delinquent, they have developed a positive attitude toward themselves, as well as toward staff members, and toward the program.

Students are also beginning to develop a positive attitude toward acquiring a salable skill; some show an interest in going for part of the day into one of the vocational programs offered at the regular high school and remaining in the ARTS program for their academic education.

Most of these students entered the program with a lack of basic academic skills needed to function in today's complex society. Recently we have added another phase of academic instruction to the program: a course in preparing students to pass the General Educational Development Test. When they are successful, they will be awarded a high school equivalency certificate. We have three students in this program now who plan to take this test in the next few weeks. It is our hope that they will be successful because it will be very encouraging to others when they see that this goal can become a reality.

Probably, the greatest accomplishment made during the past year was the area of students attitudes. As we look at the home, we find that many parents of these students seem to have limited control over their children. These parents appeared to have exhausted their ability to cope with their children's problems. Many of the students are afraid of going contrary to group pressures even when they know the group actions are wrong. Others have a negative self-concept in which they see themselves as doing nothing right. And sometimes to compensate for this negative feeling, the students have exaggerated ideas concerning the monetary worth of their salable skills in the world of work. Others feel that it is necessary to fantasize or exaggerate many socially unaccepted behaviors such as drinking, drugs, sexual relations, and malice-type actions toward themselves and toward others. These unhealthy attitudes and self-concepts have to some degree been changed during the time that they have been in this program. For example, at the close of last year, many students showed a positive attitude toward attending school and toward Project ARTS. Students seemed to be more willing to help other students. One student who was good at math helped another one who was experiencing trouble. Students cooperated in shop projects. Often students apologized to the staff for their misbehavior. Abusive language was reduced. Several students were concerned about their being able to continue in the project next year. During the summer some of the students sought out the counselors and contacted them by telephone in order to discuss problems that they encountered during the summer. Some students developed an ability to accept their mistakes humorously and joke with students and teachers about certain school incidents. And finally, many students developed pride and self-worth concerning their work.

Anecdotal records of individual students' reaction to the program have been documented. One student requested that his sister be permitted to enroll in the program. A high school student who entered the program encouraged four other students to try to enter; three of them were accepted before the school closed for the year. One student who had been very negative toward the program at first told the head counselor, "I'd be kicked out by now if I hadn't come over here." After he received his report card at the end of the year he said, "I'd sure never have passed if I hadn't come to this school." Another student who had been in the program since February of '73 said, "I'd never passed English if I hadn't come over here, Boy, that girl who decided not to enter the program is surely dumb not to come; she's not going to pass."

We also have some parents' reaction to the program. For instance, several parents have asked whether their children can return to the program next year. Some have called the staff and thanked them for the help given their children. Three parents told the head counselor that if it had not been for the ARTS program their children would have been "sent off". Four parents of their own accord visited the program to talk with the staff members. One boy brought his mother to see the facilities and to meet the staff. Two students who were assigned to the New River Youth Home requested that the home parent be invited to lunch with them at their school.

I have attempted to point out for your consideration, some of the problems we face as a result of the disruptive activities of our youth; a brief description of Project ARTS in Montgomery County; and some visible results of this project. Now I will make a few concluding statements relative to the problem of disruptive youth along with some suggestions as to what we might do about the situation.

1. The problem of disruptive youth has arisen as a product of the society which we adults

help to build and of the environment which we have created for them. The situation did not develop overnight, nor will the problem go away suddenly. People ask what went wrong for these youth. *There is no easy answer.*

2. Three hundred and seven students were expelled from Virginia schools last year and forty five thousand more were suspended during the same period. In addition to these, there is another group of students who are still in school and making little or no contribution to the educational process but have not been involved in disruptive behavior to the extent that would require their removal. Even though these students have the same educational opportunities as other students, they fail to use them wisely, and the results are the same for them as if these opportunities do not exist. I believe that special arrangements should be provided for these students to give them an additional educational opportunity so that they can have another chance for academic progress and career preparation. It will be an expensive type of instruction but the alternative of turning these students loose, as we have in the past, can be much more costly.

3. I believe that the solution lies in prevention, not rehabilitation. To prevent an undesirable act, intervention needs to occur before this act takes place. This solution is difficult because there must be an accurate way to predict the probability of a given childs' becoming delinquent, that is to identify those young people who will somehow go wrong. However, some 20 years ago Dr. Shelton and Eleanor Glueck in New York took youth at the age of six and predicted the probability of their becoming delinquent. They followed them until they were 16 and found then that they were 85% successful in their prediction. Their results indicate that there is a possibility of identifying potentional delinquents. The next step is to develop a workable preventive program for them.

4. It is better to provide funds for developing programs that would prevent youth from becoming delinquent than to allow them to become delinquent and then attempt a rehabilitation program. Spending pennies now on prevention will save dollars later for court costs and jail facilities. It will cost a great deal of money to do something about this problem, but it will cost more to do nothing. By spending a little now, we may save much later. Our superintendent of schools made a statement last week that there has never been enough money for schools, and he added, "and there never will be." The same thing may also be said of preventing juvenile delinquency.

5. The hope of the future lies with our young people. We cannot afford the tragic waste of the potential of those who become delinquent nor the personal damage to the self-concept and happiness of these young people. We must accept the challenge to do whatever is necessary to identify potential delinquents early, to provide programs to prevent the development of undesirable behavior, and to find a way to create a more satisfactory society and environment for both the present and for our children yet to be born.

PROJECT A.R.T.S. (ALTERNATE ROUTE TO SCHOOL)

PRESENTED BY:

FERGUSON MEADOWS

Montgomery County Schools

The Montgomery County School system is in its second year of funding of an innovative educational and counseling program—Project A.R.T.S. (Alternate Route to School). The project is funded by the Virginia Division of Justice and Crime Prevention with the overall objective of reducng the incidence of court appearances among teenagers in Montgomery County.

Project A.R.T.S. is located in a fomer elementary school which is adjacent to a new comprehensive high school and vocational center. This is a definite asset for Project A.R.T.S. in that the facilities of the vocational school are available to the project students on a space-available basis.

The staff of the project consists of a head counselor, two counselor coordinators, and a secretary. The head counselor is responsible for the overall direction of the program, and the two counselor-coordinators are responsible for instruction in their area of expertise. Additionally, the counselor-coordinators assist the head counselor in career exploration activities. The secretary, in addition to her normal duties, also assists project students in beginning typing, sewing, and various crafts.

The majority of the students come from low-income families. There is usually only one parent in the home and in most instances the mother or grandmother is the head of the family. Most of the students have a history of poor attendance or court records for such offenses as petty larceny to auto theft.

The program itself consists of two parts-academic and vocational. In the academic phase students are receiving GED preparation classes. On the vocational side of the picture students have the opportunity to explore the following areas:

1. Consumer Education
2. Home Economics and Related Areas
3. Cosmetology
4. Basic Electricity
5. Carpentry
6. Woodworking
7. Small Engine Repair
8. Plumbing
9. Brick masonry
10. Machine Shop

STATE CONFERENCE ON DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

PRESENTED BY:

ROY N. PUCKETT

Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce and Resources

Governor's Cabinet Office

You are all here today because you are interested in finding some answers to questions that have been asked for many, many years. I congratulate each of you, not only for your interest, but more for your dedication to the proposition that something can be done for these youth we term "Disruptive". It is becoming more and more difficult to catalog many of these people.

So, let me say that nothing I say here is an attempt to solve the mysteries that are ours and theirs, for I believe the closer we think we are to the answers the farther away we find ourselves.

While the term "Disruptive Youth" may be new to some of us, the individuals who are labeled as such are not. We have had them for a long time and we may yet have them for years to come. Not the same ones, I trust, but for every one we assist in finding himself, another will rise up to take his place.

If it is possible for some of you to think back in time long enough ago when I was a pupil in the public schools of Richmond, you can be reminded that the pupil who could not compete with his peers was called a "dummy". No one attempted to determine what made him a"dummy", but he was placed in a special class that was labeled as such, stigmatized by all who were aware, and those of us who were able to succeed were threatened with this title if we did not strive to prevent it.

Later, someone invented the words, juvenile delinquent. It wasn't difficult to become a member of this group—all one had to do was perform in an unacceptable manner and he was one. No diagnosis was made to determine why he behaved as he did—only different levels of punishment commensurate with his "crime" were considered as a cure. Some even had a scale to measure this cure—

1 Class Cut—1 demerit and one hour
Truancy—5 demerits and five hours
Chewing Gum in Class—1 demerit and one hour
Leaving School Grounds Without Permission—
3 demerits and three hours

Every new infraction caused another cure to be added to the punishment list.

We soon learned, however, that our approaches and our programs must change because the raw material we were receiving in schools was changing.

It was once thought, and I fear is still held by too many, that punishment was the logical response to an offense—we learned that punishment was, and is, largely a failure.

There are still those who work with youth who believe the ultimate cure for the disruptive is a trial in the juvenile court and a sentence to confinement. I am thankful, though, that this group is dwindling in size, and yet if you speak to those who judge our young people in the courts, they will impress you with the ever increasing numbers of cases on their dockets.

Most of you have learned that we cannot ignore, nor afford to waste, the human talent present in all offenders, especially that of the very young offender.

We reached an era when we learned that not all our youth in school are potential college students. We devised less classical courses and introduced certain vocational training courses. Many a youth was "sentenced" to these if he failed to meet success in the academic areas. Vocational classes as punishment is a stigma that still exists today in the minds of many parents who refuse to have

their children become a part of that society in the school.

Have you had to call a plumber or an electrician, or a brickmason recently? Not many of us make enough per hour to pay their costs. Have you had your car repaired recently? Do you not wish you made as much per hour as some of these mechanics make?

But you and I know that vocational training alone is not the answer for the disruptive or delinquent youth. This may be good, but it is not enough.

We once thought that counseling in any form might be the key to rehabilitation, but we found that we cannot treat the client while ignoring his world and environment.

I hope we are reaching a period of wisdom and maturity, where we are acknowledging that the problem has no simple and general solution. *Whatever* the dynamics of a particular child's delinquency, he is still a unique human being and he is the response to his social environment. We must maintain this view if we are to accomplish any type of successful treatment planned for him.

It is not enough that we treat the problems which create disruption. We will not be successful in Virginia, or any place, in warding off or eliminating or reducing the problem until we shift our emphasis to prevention. It is not enough that we prevent a delinquent from being a delinquent. We must help him make the most creative use of his human potential.

It is obvious to all of us that the services available to Virginia's youth in trouble and out of trouble have expanded dramatically during the last quarter of this century, and you and other citizens of the Commonwealth have a right to be proud of these achievements and of the leadership this state has given in certain areas of juvenile corrections.

But, Virginia, like all other states in this great nation, must put aside, in good and proper perspective, its pride. In the same 25 years during which we have made many forward strides, we have seen, also, a tempo of social, political, economic, and ideological turmoil, and man's children will always reflect the best and the worst in him. These services we offer have kept pace with neither the exploding needs of our youth nor with the potential of the technology in the behavioral sciences.

A new breed of maladjusted youth and delinquent behavior is with us. The youth in trouble today is *truly* a troubled person. He is suffering from the composite of failures in our society. Right or wrong, he has developed a new set of values for himself. The fact that he is lashing out at the pressures and contradictions makes him less likely to respond favorably to any outmoded system of treatment and training. Our philosophy and our attitudes must be geared in such a manner that we can hear what is being said.

There are certain facts and definitions we know:

1. Delinquency is a legal term which neither adequately describes behavior nor assists us in developing a program for treatment.

2. Patterns of behavior are learned *in response to* and *in contact with* a particular family and with a particular social environment. To make new behavior responses relevant to the child, any restructuring process we do must include his family and his community if at all possible.

It may be well, here, to stop and reevaluate the disruptive. Not all of your clients are delinquent. There are many who are bright, academically, and whose community and environment is of the high est level.

In this category we might put those youth who are not challenged by the subject matter being handed out by our schools. This group includes those who have a high potential for learning and are bored with the events in a classroom. These, too, become disruptive because they are anxious to respond, and yet the material is so far below their level of ability to respond, they react accordingly. They become frustrated, disinterested and disruptive, and for this we have ourselves to blame. It is just as much our duty to help these people find themselves as it is for the low ability, delinquent group.

The rule of thumb we use is numbers—if there are enough of these kinds of student (academically bright), we may organize a class to give a level of instruction commensurate with their ability—but there have to be sufficient numbers or else these students come up short.

My experience has shown me that many of our teachers refuse to cope with a situation that tends to veer from the normal. Most teachers desire, and many demand, that only certain youth may be enrolled in their courses. The moment one of these becomes disruptive, she demands, (and frequently it is granted) that this type of pupil be removed from her midst. There is not concern for his future, his problems, or his education. But we need to be concerned for him, for his kind is important, too. And then there are those administrators of school systems who are so busy trying to make a success of their careers, they forget those pupils for whom they are responsible.

We often blame our predicament on the court system of America. Too many decisions have been handed down which prevent us from working with youth, we say. We have to remember that courts have considered the youth as human beings, and we must learn that *we* must treat them as such. We have missed the opportunity to anticipate these decisions, and are quick to criticize the courts for tying their hands.

As we continue to criticize the courts, and all other agencies except ourselves, we must remember it is probably the courts which can do most to help us.

The first statewide Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court Act was passed by the General Assembly in 1922, and we have been moving gradually toward developing a program of state and local services to prevent and combat delinquency and family breakdown. It is a slow process, but it is a deliberate one.

There are a number of Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts now operating, but there are still many counties and cities where court services continue to be provided by staffs of local Welfare Departments. There is a hodgepodge of court services with varying types of structure and facilities available to localities of this state.

There are large sectors of Virginia that do not have detention facilities, mental health, family counseling and other services available.

Some of us will never be satisfied until the disruptive youth is denied attendance in schools and then locked in jail for non-attendance. I am thankful there is not space sufficient to "lock-up" all the youth we, as educators, feel should be locked up.

And yet, as we have already indicated, we need the courts for the services they now offer, or will offer, to assist us in our dilemma.

Some of us are critical of the attendance laws. In some communities the courts responsible will exercise complete authority, while in others, as in this city, the attendance laws are not enforced. Some of us say that the age limits of the law are too wide, or the entrance age is too low. Some contend that the educative process should be voluntary at all ages, while others believe the compulsion should be enforced, period.

To say that these are crucial times is not sufficient. To recognize that we have a crucial problem is probably part of the solution. Unless we face one of the most important issues we have in Virginia, the issue will become so great in the future that none of us will be able to cope with it.

We are reaching some maturity and some wisdom in our programs, but it is not enough that we continue, like a cancerous growth, to compare ourselves to the wise child who knows that he must grow but does not know how.

We have made great strides in services to the child. Let us be sure these services keep pace with the needs of our people.

STATE CONFERENCE ON DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

PRESENTED BY:

JUSTIN R. McNEILL, *Program Officer*

Region III, Office of Education

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Dr. Moorefield, Dr. Hylton, Mr. Puckett, platform guests, educators of the Commonwealth of Virginia, ladies and gentlemen. I extend greetings and best wishes for a successful conference from Dr. Walker F. Agnew, Commissioner and the Office of Education Staff of Region III, Philadelphia. We commend Dr. Hylton and staff for sponsoring this conference on Disruptive Youth, which is the concern of many educators, parents and citizens across this state and nation.

We realize that some of the (use to be) potent means of yesterday (such as the hickory stick) of dealing with disruptive behavior are no longer the answer. We may think in terms of other means of dealing with problems of this nature such as demerits, threats, isolation, deprivation of certain privileges, suspensions and finally expulsion. These methods of dealing with disruptive behavior are used frequently and in many cases resulted in what we consider as push-outs. As educators in a complex society, we must realize that it is necessary to find creative and educationally sound methods of applying our expertise in resolving the many problems which causes youth to become disruptive. According to a research team from the University of Michigan, after interviewing four (4) out of ten (10) black students in Alabama's desegregated high schools, it was indicated that the teacher alone made the difference. This research, however, does not rule out the role of school administrators and other school staff as important factors. The matter of discipline involves all aspects of the life of a school. Movement in the halls, conduct on the playgrounds, and classrooms, dress, hair styles, etc. Sometimes we become firm disciplinarians and seek to remove from our schools all pupils who are causing problems. Should we as educators spend more time initiating a preventive approach to disciplinary problems rather than a system of handling them after they occur? Is disruptive behavior a product of our inability and reluctance to deal with the necessary planning which involves school staff, students and parents? Do we allocate sufficient time to review and evaluate our school policies, curricular offerings, student activities, testing program, provision for special projects, inservice training for staff, conduct codes, auxiliary services, counseling services, drop-out rate, etc.?

We must be sensitive to the feeling and needs of students. Insensitivity of school personnel is one of the causes of disruptive behavior. For an example, a minority student sat on the front row in a class and tossed a ball of paper at the trash can and missed. The teacher (non-minority) said, *all right, garbage man,* pick it up and put it in the basket. This statement almost caused a riot in an integrated school which had been known for good human relations. It so happened that this boy's father was a garbage collector and this reference was taken as a defamatory statement toward him and other black pupils in the school. The teacher intended no wrong. She just slipped.

The time will come when we pass the tensions, when we do not have to be so guarded or careful in what we say. The American people, including youth, have a way of taking things lightly and seeing jokes in all kinds of situations. I am thinking of a school where they had a rather outstanding football team, *predominately white,* but with a half dozen black students on the squad. When they were to scrimmage, they dressed out in red uniforms, when they were not to scrimmage, they dressed out in white. The coach placed a notice on the bulletin board, saying, *Dress Today, Whites Only.* The black members of the squad as a group gathered around the coach with such exclamations as Coach! Coach! Coach!, don't we get to practice today? Fortunately, they made a big joke of it and it was all fun for all.

The purpose here is to choose a few problems to illustrate how, through insensitive statements and announcements problems evolve. Through discus-

sions and development of understanding, problems may be resolved and a school may operate with a feeling that will bring out the best in all students and everyone else who is invovled in the operation of a school.

As we consider the conference theme, I wish to discuss some federal funded programs such as Title IV and Emergency School Aid Act which are designed to provide equal educational opportunities for elementary and secondary students regardless of race, color or national origin. These two programs operated in conjunction with state and local resources have had a positive impact on schools and served as a preventive in regards to disruptive behavior.

Desegregation Assistance Program under Title IV provides for awards as authorized by sections 403, 404 and 405 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-532 for technical assistance, training institutes, and grants to School Boards in connection with desegregation of public elementary and secondary schools. Under Section 403, technical assistance can be provided by State Educational Agencies for such activities as:

1. Planning and other activities designed to insure that administrators, teachers, and other educational personnel who are members of minority groups are not demoted or dismissed in the process of, or as a result of desegregation.
2. Assessment of desegregation related educational needs in one or more public schools.
3. Development of administrative methods and techniques to cope with special educational problems occasioned by disegregation.
4. Development of educational programs, materials, and methods for use in desegregated classroom situations.
5. Training of administrators, teachers, or other public school personnel in the implementation or use of methods, techniques, programs, and materials to cope with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation.
6. Development of techniques for communications or interaction between public schools or school systems and the minority and nonminority group communities affected by the desegregation schools or school systems.
7. Technical assistance to public school administrative staff in determining the availability and appropriate utilization of funds under other Federal and State programs which would assist in coping with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation.
8. Training of administrative staffs in efficient and educationally sound methods of assigning students to and within public schools.

Under Section 404—Training Institutes—Institutions of higher education may apply for grants for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary and secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation. Individuals attending such institutes on a full time basis may be paid stipends for the period of their attendance.

Under Section 405—Grants may be made to School Boards to defray costs of:

1. Giving teachers and other school personnel inservice training dealing with problems incident to desegregation.
2. Employment of specialists to advise in problems incident to desegregation.

Any School Board is eligible for assistance which is desegregating its schools or which is desegregated and is seeking to maintain or enhance its desegregated status may make application for a grant to deal with problems arising fom the assignment of students to and within public schools without regard to race, color, religion or national origin.

Under Grants to G A C 'S (General Assistance Centers) public or private organizations (including Colleges and Universities) may apply for funds to provide assistance to school districts in the preparation, adoption and implementation of desegregation plans. Service areas are determined geographically according to the need for desegregation assistance. Each center is to be responsible

for providing a comprehensive range of technical assistance and training services to desegregating or desegregated school districts located within its service area. As evidence of need of such services, applicants must present letters from districts within its service area stating specific desegregation-related needs and requesting assistance from the applicant organization.

This federally funded program under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act has enabled many school districts across our nation to identify, plan and implement various activities which have dealt with many of the underlying causes which have allegedly contributed to the precipitation of disruptive behavior on the part of students. In resolving problems related to school ddesegregation, it has subsequently helped to resolve other problems which affects students. Many educational staff (professional and non-professional) have learned to recognize and deal more effectively with the causes of disruptive behavior as a result of Title Programs. *In Virginia alone*, there are *five* (*5*) federally funded Title IV Projects—*SEA* (*1*), *GAC* (*1*) and *LEAS* (*3*). The implementation of these projects have assisted administrators and teachers in the identification, planning and implementation of programs which are designed to improve the education of youth.

Under Public Law 92-318—we have the Title VII —The Emergency School Aid Act. Congress finds that the process of eliminating or preventing minority group isolation and improving the quality of education for all children involves the expenditure of additional funds to which local educational agencies do not have access. The purpose of ESAA (Emergency School Aid Act) is to provide financial assistance—

1. To meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in Elementary and Secondary schools.
2. To encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in Elementary and Secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students.
3. To aid school children in overcoming the educationally disadvantages of minority group isolation.

Some of the authorized activities under the ESAA program are:

1. Remedial services (usually in the basic skill areas of reading and mathematics) beyond those provided under the regular school program conducted by school districts, including student-to-student tutoring, to meet the special needs of children (including gifted and talented) in schools which are affected by a plan.
2. The provision of additional professional or other staff members (including staff members specially trained in problems incident to school desegregation or the elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation) and the training and retraining of staff for such schools.
3. Recruiting, hiring and training of teacher aides, provided that in recruiting teacher aides, preference is given to parents of children attending ESAA schools assisted under this title.
4. Inservice teacher training designed to enhance the success of schools assisted under this title, through contracts with institutions of higher education, or other institutions, agencies, and organizations determined by the assistant secretary to have special competence for such purpose.
5. Comprehensive guidance, counseling, and other personal services for such children.
6. The development and use of new curricula and instructional methods, practices, and techniques (and the acquisition of instructional materials relating thereto) to support a program of instruction for children from all racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds, including instruction in the language and cultural heritage of minority groups.
7. Educational programs using shared facilities for career education and other specialized activities.
8. Innovative interracial programs or projects involving the joint participation of minority group children and other children attending different schools, including extracurricular activities and cooperative exchanges or other arrangements between schools within the same or different school

districts.

9. Community activities, including public information efforts, in support of a plan, program, project or activity described in this title.

10. Administrative and auxiliary services to facilitate the success of the program, project or activity.

11. Planning programs, projects, or activities under Title VII, the evaluation of such programs, projects or activities, and dissemination of information with respect to such programs, projects or activities.

12. Repair or minor remodeling or alteration of existing facilities (and the lease of mobile classroom units or other mobile education facilities).

Under Section 703—Special Programs and Projects—Provisions have been made for grants to, and contracts with, public and private non-profit agencies, institutions, and organizations to carry out programs or projects designed to support the development or implementation of a plan, program, or activity designed to accomplish the purposes of the ESSA legislation.

The federally funded programs, Title IV and ESSA, and other federal programs, are designed to operate in conjunction with state and local resources in an effort to provide equal educational opportunities for Elementary and Secondary students regardless of race, creed, religion or national origin. These programs impact upon disruptive youth in a positive manner through their participating in special activities which meet their needs. Through these programs, there is great potential for the development of acceptance, mutual respect and cooperation, which are the marks of a truly integrated school. As educators and citizens seeking support of our public schools we must always remember the three basic needs of youth—Acceptance, Affection and Achievement.

SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE
DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Recorder's Form

Session: 1 Recorder: William M. Moore

Group: A Facilitator: Dr. Lillian P. Jennings

The following is a synopsis of the remarks made by Mr. Anderson, Superintendent of Prince Edward Schools on the topic: "School Administrators in Relation to Disruptive Youths." Mr. Anderson suggested that there were two prime sources that caused problems, the first being societal, and the second being in school.

As he defined the two, societal dealt primarily with the violence within the world. He mentioned particularly the wars in Southeast Asia and their effect on the American culture through the mass media. He alluded to the violence of the war being projected on the television screen on the late news every evening for everyone to see. He also talked in terms of violence in general and in the newspapers.

Another area within the society had to do with the innercity, the poor, and the socio-economically deprived, who because of their situations, many times lived in a world plagued with violence. This among other things affected the thinking of youth and often leads to disruptions.

In terms of the in school factors, he mentioned that the students wanted an opportunity to have input into curriculum planning so that the curriculum could include items that were relevant to today, and such items as extra curricula activities where one segment of the student body is being prevented from participating in certain activities. Examples mentioned, were such things as blacks being restricted from being cheerleaders, poor being restricted from participating in the band because of the cost of uniforms, etc.

The third area that he mentioned was the enforcement and dictation of the dress code, in which the students have no part in establishing. Overcrowding of schools causing students to share the same locker, noisy classrooms, and hallways, also contribute to the conditions.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE
DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Recorder's Form

Session: 1 Recorder: William M. Moore

Group: A Facilitator: Dr. Lillian P. Jennings

Mr. Anderson stated that it was almost, if not impossible, to separate the in-school from societal causes for disruption. At the conclusion of his presentation, there was period for discussion concerning some of his statements, and one question proposed created a lengthy debate; "Was there a fair and equal treatment for all students, regardless of their situations, when corrective actions had to be taken"? The opposing view was that equal treatment did not allow opportunity for individualizing corrective action, and no decision as to which of the two was most appropriate was reached in the time alloted.

One of the most important thoughts that came from the discussion was that punitive action did little to correct the situation and that more time should be devoted to working with disruptive youth in an attempt to identify and eliminate the cause rather than punishing the students when they did something wrong without attempting to eliminate the cause of disruption.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE
DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Counseling and Psychological Service in Relation to Disruptive Youth

Recorder's Form

Session: Small group–Phase I

Recorder: Clinton Turner

Group: B–Byrd Room

Facilitator: Virginia Hogan

Consultant: Dr. Rondle Edwards

A. Issues Raised By the Group

1. Disruptive behavior is adjustive behavior
2. Psychologist and Counselors true role is that of an "adjustive expert" in the school system.
3. Some methods used by successful counselors are peer counseling and the reality approach.
4. School administrators and counselors should be aware of the legal ramifications before assigning students to special programs or special schools. (public law 93-380).

B. Points of Agreement Within the Group

1. Team effort between counselors and psychologist has gained momentum in the last several years.
2. The Group process is a good way to include those potential drop-outs and push-outs within the counseling session and there-by reduce the disruptive element within the school.
3. The successful counselor will use every approach within his or her means to reach his clients.
4. The successful counselor and psychologist will make every effort to work with special groups within the community.
5. Counselors and psychologist will involve parents and/or guardian in the counseling process.
6. The successful counselor will devote more time with those student preparing to enter into the world of work than has been allocated to this group in the pass.
7. The counseling process should start at an early age to properly diagnosis and screen all students so as to minimize the disruptive behavior within the school system. This group should remain fluid so that the students will be able to make progress at their own rate.

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH AND SCHOOL CLUBS AND CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

SMALL GROUP PRESENTATION BY:

JULIAN R. MOORE
Director, Pupil Personnel Services
Roanoke City Schools

"Disruptive Youth Conference"—what a depressing title for a workshop. According to Webster disrupt means to break apart; split up; rend asunder. That makes one think very negatively in relation to our job. However, to be realistic one must deal with the problems that fall out of the experiences of people who are working together and going in so many different ways. To further complicate this whole matter brought before this conference we must also concern ourselves with the present desegregated school environment with a mission to achieve integration. Desegregation, of course, is not the ultimate; it is and has been the beginning. As educators and leaders we have forecast that desegregation is the first step and will bring integration to our schools. What does desegregation mean? Frankly it means very little. Desegregation is merely the physical mixing of different racial or ethnic groups. We can then come up with all of the terms "racially different", "culturally different", "educationally different", and all kinds of differences rather than looking at how much people are alike. In other words, it focuses attention on these differences to such a degree that the language talks about "they—on the other side", which rarely brings about the *we*. It is aimed at achieving some sort of numerical balance between the races or ethnic groups. *Integration*, on the other hand, is an experience of heart and mind, rather than a bodily process. It involves individual and group attitude changes (e.g., the removal of fears, hatreds, suspicions, and stereotypes) and is engendered by living with other racial and ethnic groups in an atmosphere of mutual respect and understanding.

With integration, every person receives a sincere invitation to swim in the main-stream of American life. This is the essence of democracy—and developing the democratic citizen is the main job of the school. We see, therefore, that desegregation is educationally valuable only as the first step toward integration. The logical corollary is: the educator must *not* be content with mere desegregation.

We must work at development of acceptance of all students and a cooperative arrangement whereby they can live and study together if our schools are expected to be effective educational tools. Our needs encompass everything from the development of interpersonal relationships between individuals, such as teachers and pupils, curriculum and instructional organization, school regulations and traditions, and *student activities*. Our failure to deal effectively in these areas is causing us to flunk the test of effectiveness in our educational endeavors.

There are many reasons for this kind of behavior. Heading the list is the usual excuse of "there is not enough time to do the kind of job we would like". Secondly, the matter of change is not easy to comprehend nor is it always accepted. My experiences of the past five years have led me to believe that behaviors must change first and then the attitudinal change will bring about the necessary progress. People who experience change always start at a stage where they may have complete disbelief or they are pressured to remain with the status quo. However, with a gradual change of perception the necessary adjustments can be made. Many of us are all wrapped up in what has been, and we fail to recognize the need and the importance of integrated education. Finally, we cannot continue to direct our attention to only the academic program and exclude the extracurricular or out-of-class activities for our students. The extracurricular activities are a vital part of the total school program. As educators we cannot overlook the benefits to be gained from a strong academic program supported by and infused with appropriate and well-defined extracurricular activities. Given, such activities are not expected to make up for weaknesses in other areas of the school program, but

they should provide additional motivation to students who become actively involved in them.

Since the massive desegregation of the secondary schools in 1970, many efforts have been made to involve all students in activities but these efforts have failed, in part, because we have forgotten some of the minor things about people. On the part of black students it is most important that we continue to recruit membership in clubs and other activities which tend to be the backbone of the activities program. In other words, the pump has not been fully primed. Our perception must lead us to the understanding that an individual who has been physically placed in a new location needs continued support before his involvement becomes voluntary. Activities such as the National Honor Society, dramatic clubs and classes, foreign language clubs and others carry standards that tend to resegregate in their own way. A look at the requirements in most cases will reveal a kind of "home group" standard that eliminates "our" club, "our" activity. What I mean here is that the total student body becomes possessive of these activities and takes pride in the accomplishment. Economic factors may include the prohibitive cost of membership in organizations or the unwillingness of parents to invest money in the activities of the child. On the positive side of the register is the formation of new friendships resulting from voluntary participation while pursuing common interests in frequent occurrences. Research has revealed that extra- or co-curricular activities assist in developing social confidence. Further study shows that social and civic competence—the ability to get along with people and to cooperate successfully in our democratic society, are closely related to activities.

In many cases, disruptive students can be traced to the matter of school activities. From my own experience it has been connected with some of the following activities:

1. Inclusion of black students in homecoming activities
2. Cheerleaders
3. Representation in student government associations
4. Athletics
5. Black History Programs
6. Inclusion of Black History in the curriculum

During the "honeymoon period" (1970-73) black students were elected to high offices, in some cases without manipulating, weights on votes, etc. Various methods were devised to insure that black students were represented on Student Government and other similar associations within the school. In this year, 1974-75, it appears that we are of the belief that it is no longer necessary to assess the involvement of various ethnic groups in the main-stream of the school program. I insist that we must make every effort to develop practices that will be acceptable by all students. Our goal must be directed toward the establishment of integration as the social norm of all phases of school activities. We must recognize the fact that our goal is *school integration*. It is impossible for us to solve all of the community's problems in our schools. But we must work toward creating an environment that is cooperative, fair, accepting and friendly to all students. We must take the same stance with the integration of students' activities as we have taken with the total school program. We must first desegregate students' activities and then move toward integration.

Our question then is what do we do to insure integration in student activities. Assuming that student activities are voluntary, we can't make them participate, nor is such a thing permissible. Again, in my own experiences of the past students have been able to deal with this problem if they can depend on us for assistance. The greatest support for creating maximum involvement is a friendly welcome from the people who are already involved. If students make efforts to belong to organizations and do not get the vote or they are not made to feel welcome, they soon drop out of the activity. Goals of activities must be made to fit the total student body. Input from all groups is necessary.

Student cooperative associations or student councils can be made to serve as a primary vehicle for the development of integrated activities. We should take a look at the role of this organization. Should students be given the opportunity to deal effectively with these matters? It has been suggested that student governments should have the following purposes:

1. To represent the interests and concerns of all the students and
2. To furnish a means through which students can participate in the decision-making process of the school.

These purposes suggest the following roles for the student council:

1. A channel through which student concerns may be communicated to the council and school administration
2. A research agency to investigate student concerns and to develop substantive proposals to be made to the administration
3. An advisory group to the school administration, and
4. An appeals channel to represent student grievances.

The selection process involving student governments has caused problems in that the power is maintained by students of just the majority. This organization must be made up of representatives of all of the groups in the school. In my own school community methods involving the drawing of voting precincts were designed to insure that all students were represented geographically but were represented according to the attendance areas. There is no pure answer to getting pure representation. However, efforts must be directed toward heterogeneity in the composition of student governments. Again, I think the climate of the school has a lot to do with the outcome of elections as well as voluntary involvement. Students recognize the necessary goals to produce an integrated educational climate. If given the opportunity, they would be willing to get involved in the political process of decision-making. They can share the responsibility for working out agreements and compromise and protecting the rights of each other. They can develop a greater understanding of the need for compromise and of the difficulty in finding workable solutions to the problems that face us today. (Use example of merging of two high schools).

As we sit here in this conference today discussing disruptive youth, I can't help but accept the fact that we as adults are disruptive in nature. We sit high on our thrones and theorize about democracy and, on the other hand, are guilty of not perceiving problems that can lead to disruption. The sum total of our experiences as professionals should prepare us adequately to read the signs of unrest and see the seeds as they are planted. Our failure to act reminds me of the way certain animals deal with conflict. The lion sees a conflict and says, "I am ready to fight". The ostrich sees a conflict and buries his head in the sand. A famous animal called the lemming jumps off the cliff and commits suicide. As educators we cannot afford to solve our conflicts in any of those ways. We must accept the fact that conflict is unavoidable in a free society.

We need not expect changes to take place without some disputes and misunderstandings. The bases for relationships are not formed without action and reaction. Administrators and teachers must expect and accept trials and conflicts as a part of the desegregation-integration process. Such trials and conflicts represent the releasing of prejudices and biases. At the same time, however, administrators and teachers must be willing to search objectively for a reasonable solution to the problems.

Schools have been called workshops of democracy. Educational leaders now have the opportunity in their relationships to faculty and students to prove the validity of this statement through their own effective use of the democratic processes.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE
DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Recorder's Form

Session: 1 Recorder: Frank Cuthrell

Group: C Facilitator: Frank Cain

A. Issues Raised by the Group

1. How do you involve "these" students in clubs?
2. Is money a problem in order for these clubs to function?
3. In a small country school, can resource people be a problem?

B. Points of Agreement Within the Group

1. disruption can cause growth
2. disruptive youth are the last ones to participate in clubs.
3. students and parents in the community and school personnel can be used as resource people.
4. Interest groups held during school day are effective "clubs".
5. we do not want to alienate the disruptive youth by identification.
6. a student can be motivated the "wrong way".
7. with clubs, attendance will improve

C. Comments and/or Recommendations for Action by the Group

1. "Field trips" can be effective for the youth that is not interested in "anything".
2. Open up all clubs with no restrictions.
3. organize skill develope classes.
4. Karate clubs with certain rules such as a "C" on conduct required for admission.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Recorder's Form

Session: 1 Recorder: Frank Cuthrell

Group: C Facilitator: Frank Cain

D. Remarks by the Consultant:

1. Integration is educationally valuable.
2. Behavior must change and then attitude will change.
3. The students can help solve many of the problems.
4. Extra-Curricular activities must supplement a strong academic program.
5. We must continue to recruit blacks in the clubs and activities.
6. Honor society, Drama clubs, etc., tend to segregate the student body.
7. The economic factors can affect membership in clubs.
8. New friendships can come out of club activities.
9. Include blacks in homecoming activities.
10. Cheerleading has carried qualities other than cheering.
11. Black History in curriculum is most important.
12. Human relation committees are useful.
13. A school must have order and create a wholesome climate for teaching and learning.
14. The goals of activities must meet the needs of the students.
15. SCA organizations are effective channels of communication.

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH: EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

SMALL GROUP PRESENTATION BY:

DR. JEAN A. MOOREFIELD

Assistant Supervisor

Office for School Integration Services

State Department of Education

I. Programs As They Now Exist In Virginia
   A. Too theoretical
   B. Unrelated to the "real" world of school
   C. Textbooks too idealistic

II. Student Apathy
   A. Causes
   B. Curriculum changes
   C. Solutions

III. Teacher Apathy
   A. Recruitment
   B. Screening device
   C. Commitment to education

IV. Suggested Changes In Teacher Preparation Programs
   A. Curriculum—Multiethnic/Multicultural
   B. Student/Teacher preparation
   C. Behavior Modification Techniques as related to disruptive youth
   D. Human Relations Unit
   E. Value clarification

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Recorder's Form

Session: I Recorder: Mr. Thomas M. Lewis

Group: D Facilitator: Mrs. Margaret Moss

1. In college programs—Theory and Practice should be more closely correlated—a closer union of philosophy and practice.
2. Student teachers should begin their practicum earlier—in freshmen and sophomore year—not necessarily for grades but see classes in action.
3. Student teachers need more education dealing with personal problems and human relations, drug education.
4. Curriculum for student teachers should be geared along affective as well as cognitive lines (should learn performance objective).
5. College professors should get out in the real world more frequently and see what is going on in the classroom in public schools.
6. Better screening, in college by advisors and counselors, of individuals entering the teaching profession (no specific method or points considered).

THE COMMUNITY AND THE DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

SMALL GROUP PRESENTATION BY:

W. A. JOHNSON, *Assistant Superintendent*

Chesapeake Public Schools

In attempting to understand the implications of the recent interest of the community in the public schools, it is important to distinguish between the accountability in which the schools were held prior and after the Supreme Court's landmark school desegregation decision of 1954.

Prior to the desegregation of schools in Virginia, parents generally did not interfere with the educational program or operation of the schools; however, they did hold the schools accountable for results. Parents, both black and white, were committed to their children's education and made every attempt to aid the schools to develop a program of academic excellence.

During the first ten years after the *Brown vs. Topeka,* Kansas school desegregation case, communities devoted their efforts to evading or delaying the Supreme Court's mandate. This period was followed by the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which provided an administrative tool for the enforcement of non-discrimination in education.

During the past decade, school systems across the state have been working quietly toward converting to unitary school systems in compliance with federal desegregation standards.

In moving toward compliance, many systems ran into serious snags in implementing their plans which often resulted in phasing out formerly black schools.

The unitary school systems from the beginning witnessed many disruptions by students of both races. The direct actions in the schools created an alarming concern in communities across the state. An atmosphere of tension was perceived by students for months. A substantial per cent of students revealed that they were afraid of some students in their schools. Safety in many cases became a very real factor.

Increased community interest in the operation of the public schools is related indirectly to the school-community problems created by disruptive youth. It is interesting to note that disruptive students are of no particular ethnic or economic group and can range anywhere from being psychotic and economically poor to intelligent and financially stable.

A national survey revealed that schools in dealing with the disruptive youth, suspended and expelled black students at an average rate twice that of whites. Black students amounted to 27 per cent of the total school enrollment, but accounted for 37 per cent of the expulsions and 42 per cent of the suspensions.

The Black community became alarmed at these statistics because, traditionally, black parents have viewed education as the means by which their children would achieve a better life. In fact, they saw education as a means for providing access to economic prosperity and all other elements of the "American dream".

A survey revealed that in Falls Church High School, Fairfax County, Virginia, teachers felt that black students got away with more disruptive behavior than white students. In return, black students perceived this to mean that the teachers didn't care about them. It was further revealed that the school was not a relaxed school. The survey committee found "a routine that bordered on apathy, a lack of school spirit, boredom, and a mechanical way of going through the school day".

Hundreds of schools across the country are experiencing similar conditions daily. As recent as last month the Richmond City School System took steps to prevent recurrences of attacks on women in city schools. Also, a number of parents reacting to the changing school conditions withdrew their children from the public schools in various communities across the state.

Fortunately, special surveys conducted by school systems revealed that only a small percentage of parents and guardians removed their children from the public school systems because of desegregation, busing, discipline problems, and the quality of education their children were receiving.

Community leaders are aware that the racial mixing of the schools has brought into sharp focus the widening gap in the goals of education. They are demanding that education concentrate on the quality of life in the schools, not just for students, but for all those who live in the schools every day.

In a large sense community leaders are calling upon educators to lay aside their differences and remold the public school system to meet the needs of today's youth. Yes, pressures from the community are sounding the cry for instant change, realizing that the expansion of educational opportunities for all students is a vital force in the improvement of national and international relations. It just might be that the pressures now being exerted by the various community forces will be the salvation of education for all.

A Nashville, Tennessee, task force on discipline, which contained lay representation, identified a prominent cause of discipline problems—a breakdown of communications between the school and the home. According to this group, the relationship between the home and the school has deteriorated to the point that parents and schools no longer have common understanding and expectations in regard to learning or behavior. Traditional channels of communication and interaction between the school and the general community have not been adequate with the resulting frustration, misunderstandings, and conflicts from both groups.

The solution to the disruptive youth problem will demand that discipline standards be constantly evaluated and re-evaluated in all schools.

Alternative and rehabilitative type centers should be explored for possible assistance where needed.

More community advisory groups and community awareness councils should be appointed to discuss concerns or anticipated problems with a view toward working out solutions to school problems.

The PTA should promote parent dialogue groups as a means of helping parents to become informed regarding offerings and expectations in schools for multi-ethnic-racial students.

Increasing participation by students in the administration of schools should be considered in promoting a favorable school climate for learning.

In relating to this topic, that of the community and its disruptive youth, the question remains: How can schooling be changed to accommodate differences among children and to facilitate the development of all, rather than of a fraction, of the population? It is clear that a change will be necessary and must be relevant to the academic demand that are made on students.

Virginia's experience should be a consistent determination to look at the long-range impact of the desegregation challenge and to focus on its implication for public education.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Recorder's Form

Session: II Recorder: Dale G. Robinson

Group: A Facilitator: Francis T. Phillips, Jr.

A. Issues Raised By the Group

1. Can school facilities, with programs and resources that appeal to and meet the needs of disruptive youth, be opened to the community on weekends and evenings (community school concept)? Is this a priority item? What about the expense involved? Can budgets today provide for this?
2. What impact are the accountability issue and competition for the tax dollar having on the funding of programs for disruptive youth? Do we have to convince the community that we are doing something for *all* youth before we can justify large expenditures on disruptive youth?
3. How can community school type programs be made attractive to disruptive youth? How can peer influence be used in these programs to positively influence disruptive youth?
4. How will the increased influence of parents over what will be taught affect school programs?
5. Should we not loose sight of the central place of the regular classroom teacher and the need for her to be preventive and developmental?
6. Can guidance counselors be given more time to deal effectively with disruptive youth by being relieved of clerical duties; would differentiated staffing including use of paraprofessionals help?

B. Comments and/or Recommendations for Action by the Consultant

1. Pressures from the community may be good for education.
2. Traditional channels of communication between school and community have not been adequate.
3. A solution to the disruptive youth problem must include continual re-examination of discipline standards in schools.
4. There is a need for more advisory groups and parent dialogue groups.
5. Schools must change to accommodate the needs of and to be relevant to academic demands placed on students.

CHANGING MORES AND THE DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

SMALL GROUP PRESENTATION BY:

DR. ROBERT T. FROSSARD

Area Director

Richmond Public Schools

(This statement is offered with full awareness that literally hundreds of behaviors might be scrutinized as possible changing mores, but with the hope that a few can be singled out for productive discussions here at this conference. Also, mores is restricted in meaning to denote required behavior and important ideas within a society rather than a more general notion of customs and folkways.)

Although real changes in customs can only be distinguished from fads by rather long periods of time, it would appear that the urban student is becoming rather comfortable with several ideas and behaviors that suggest enduring qualities. Let us examine a few of these.

Since the writing of the U. S. Constitution, the individual and individual rights have been exalted in this land beyond that of all countries in the history of the world. Certainly the decade of the sixties, with its emphasis upon minority rights has caused all of us to refocus our perceptions, and to make efforts to bring our rhetorice and our behavior into congruence. Learning the concept of individualism well, the modern urban student has rejected many of the old conformities and has challenged many of the rituals of acceptable behavior.

Though some scholars offer a converse theory, that individuality springs from the desire to escape the vastness we now describe as the urban mass and that recognition is the only antidote to anomie or meaninglessness of modern urban society. Whatever the reason, individuality is winning the battle with conformity whether its the muscular young man who refuses to participate in athletics in favor of the style show, or the young lady who demands the opportunity for athletics long denied the high school coed.

Perhaps we should look upon the positive side of our teaching efforts, and realize how long we have struggled to develop students who engage in critical thinking rather than rote learning and ponder what impact this has had upon individuality.

Another popular conception which is useful in viewing changing mores is that of pluralism. Remember the "good old days" when issues had only two views and the majority ruled the day. Well, pluralism has come to the schoolhouse political scene, and students now express a variety of views and often can command a variety of alternative responses. Since most of these issues are often based upon values, and since there are no real experts in values, it appears that multiple responses are the only realistic answers.

In a sense individualism and pluralism are only symptoms of a concept known as an "open society". In all probability, the urban student is increasingly perplexed by signs of closedness on the part of parents, teachers, and administrators. The participatory concept has caught on with students who wish to discuss lessons and not be lectured to by instructors. Students freely speak out concerning class boredom, impersonalization of relationships between staff and students, and the lack of opportunity to be significantly involved in planning their own study.

In fairness to staff members we have evolved some outlandish barriers to providing warmer relationships with students, such as the size of our schools, the number of students each staff member teaches daily, and tight academic and bus schedules providing full and formal but impersonal days. It is heartening to note that some of the larger urban areas are making organizational changes to reverse these conditions. The question is rather clear: Can we really have significant cognitive development and so totally ignore the affective domain?

All of the aforementioned is disquieting, but basically positive in nature; however, there are two aspects of modern urban societies that are, in my opinion, most unproductive. Realistically we all know that the student receives only a part of his education from school. The urban community has been denounced by such individuals as the U. S. Attorney General as lacking the ability to rehabilitate a well-intentioned criminal who has paid his societal debt. It is hard to imagine how this environment reinforces any positive attitudinal notions presented by the schools. In fact, many of these "significant others" who impress the youth, appear as the *only* relevant persons to the urban child who suffers social disintegration at home and apparent rejection at school. While small towns and rural areas often mixed the socioeconomic classes, at least in school, the "have-nots" have now been "ghettoized" in the city and thus negative social behaviors receive considerable peer support.

The second disturbing behavior, due to many factors, is the separation of the parents from their schools. Racism, fear, rumor, and the demise of schools in close proximity to homes have all contributed to this condition. While individualism, pluralism, and participation are all positive in nature, outlandish and dysfunctional behaviors often result from a lack of a cooperative bond among the adults of the school, home, and community. It is not unusual for each segment to know nothing, or at least very little, of the other. Thus, no consistency of work or deed has much chance of either developing positively influencing the urban youth.

The above ideas are not solutions to problems but instead are only a few observations about changing ideas and behaviors as they relate to productive and nonproductive development of our youth. The challenge for us is to develop the complex understanding that will help us sort out behavior for what it really is and use this understanding judiciously.

To summarize the above notions regarding changes in mores, (that is, required behaviors) as they relate to the disruptive youth, they are as follows:

1. The modern urban youth detects a wide divergency between word and deed relating to the importance of the individual.
2. Individuality must be encouraged if the student is to escape the selflessness of the modern urban population.
3. The school setting is seen as too restrictive and closed for the participatory urges of the urban youth.
4. We must reorganize our schools if we are to meet the demand for personalization expected by the student.
5. We must recognize other educational "agencies" such as the community and the home, and work cooperatively and imaginatively with them to provide consistency in our efforts to develop effective citizenship for us all.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Recorder's Form

Session: II Recorder: Ronnie G. Bugnar

Group: B Facilitator: Richard Chubb

Dr. Frossard's brief remarks revolved around certain key problems in urban education and changing student mores. Three apparent trends in the changing ideas of students are; the students' desire to express their individuality, the students' demand that the schools become more pluralistic in nature, and the students' desire for a more open and less restricted atmosphere in the schools. Urban students are rejecting the old conformities. These students see the incongruency between the educator's rhetoric and his behavior, especially in regard to the worth of the individual. While the educator emphasizes this worth, he finds it difficult to accept students as individuals.

Dr. Frossard raised the question of whether schools could neglect the effective domain and still be effective. He also stated that many schools in the urban areas had become utterly meaningless for the ghetto child. A serious problem here, he said, is the tremendous separation which exists between the home and the school.

Points raised in our discussion:

1. Educators must deal with the affective domain if they are to be successful. Teachers should place emphasis on guiding and counseling their students.
2. Educators may be responsible for the questioning attitudes of today's youth as they have urged students to think critically and to question.
3. The emphasis of today's youth on individuality demands that educators listen to individuals.
4. The pluralism of this society necessitates that its schools must accept different life styles and cultures.
5. Adults have changed their ideas about traditional behavior also. Students see teachers protesting for better working conditions.
6. What is the influence on students of teachers who serve as examples for their students?
7. Youth will not accept adults' statements that a certain action is wrong. Adults must give relevant answers to these questions.
8. Guidance Counselors should play a much more important role in school life. They must be freed from scheduling and paper work. They should work with students, parents and teachers.

STUDENT DISRUPTION AND SOCIAL CHANGE

SMALL GROUP PRESENTATION BY:

DR. BOYD BOSMA

Division of Civil Liberties and Intergroup Relations

National Education Association

There have been two great movements in this century that have led to expansion of educational opportunity to a degree greater than at any time of our national history. Both of these were connected with the yellow school bus.

The first was during the period after World War I when the school bus was used to assist in consolidation of school districts to permit the development of larger and better schools, improvement of curriculum, and expansion of educational resources to benefit children.

The second great period of reform in education in this country has taken place in only the last five or ten years, and also involves the yellow school bus.

Although public reaction has sometimes been less supportive than in the earlier period, an objective evaluation of the effects of school desegregation in recent years has to recognize the rapid expansion of knowledge about learning, the dramatic growth of programs to individualize and humanize education, and the development of creative programs to expand opportunity. At the same time, we can all be grateful for the events which have led to greater understanding of the rights of students and teachers and others, and which have helped to open up many schools toward a greater awareness of the need for increased responsiveness to individual needs and rights.

The point of this is that when school systems have viewed desegregation as an *opportunity* for reform and improvement of education, tremendously beneficial changes have resulted.

Unfortunately, where community leaders or school authorities have resisted desegregation, and, more particularly, have failed to live up to the intent of the law in elimination of discrimination and expansion of opportunity, student disruption is sometimes a product of such resistance.

Not all disruption can be traced to the desegregation process, although it is probably the greatest concern of those of us who are attending this meeting. Other social changes in recent years have also had a part in affecting alienation and disruption in the schools. Some of these may be symptoms rather than causes, but all are interrelated aspects of the rapid social changes we have been experiencing in recent years:

1. Changing social values resulting from the population curve, the unusually large numbers of students in high schools and colleges in the late 1960's and 1970's.
2. Increased use of drugs and marijuana.
3. Loosening of family and community bonds, including a widespread decline in organized community recreational and socializing activities for young people.
4. Increased alienation between young people, their families, and social institutions.
5. Mobility.
6. Disillusionment with societal and political institutions, often related both to the role of the United States in Southeast Asia and to the whole Watergate debacle.
7. Economic and employment uncertainties.

Because many of these changes have resulted in dramatic changes in values and patterns of behavior, and also because of the loosening of the social contract, traditional approaches to discipline and classroom control are often inappropriate and non-responsive, including especially such practices

as corporal punishment, suspensions, and expulsions.

One major result, an unproductive one, has been that many schools have increased efforts to force children to adapt to rigid and unrealistic learning situations, rather than providing for effective student involvement in helping the institution itself to adapt to changing needs. The schools too often seem to be going on an entirely different path than their students, with little or no effective communication occurring, and the resulting alienation and disruption is a natural product.

Unfortunately, we talk about compulsory education in too narrow terms. Our acceptance of compulsory attendance requirements focuses in the wrong direction. Instead of merely making it compulsory for students to attend school, we need to be looking for means to make it compulsory for the schools to attend children.

If schools could find ways to more effectively adapt to the needs of children, including both the institution of new programs and alternatives, as well as the elimination of the vestiges of segregation and discrimination and those practices which have discriminatory effects and which screen opportunities for poor and minority children, even more improvement could occur.

More particularly, if school authorities could find it possible to utilize student disruption as an *opportunity* to improve learning and to reform educational practices, they might also find it easier to resist the tendency toward self-defeating, short-range punitive practices.

While it may be difficult to view disruption in an optimistic light, I believe that positive changes have already occurred and will continue to occur as enlightened teachers, counselors, and school administrators exploit the opportunities provided through the recognition that disruption is usually a symptom of needed changes.

These positive effects of schools' attempts to deal with disruption include a number of significant developments:

1. Recognition of the institutional processes leading to the student pushout phenomenon and attempts to deal with them.
2. Litigation and court ruling establishing constitutional rights of students and legal accountability of school officials and school boards.
3. Development of creative alternative programs to meet special needs of students.
4. Utilization of new approaches leading to more effective student, teacher, parent, and community involvement in educational decision-making.
5. Changing assumptions about the appropriateness of traditional punitive disciplinary measures, notably detention, corporal punishment, and exclusion.
6. New efforts to personalize and humanize education and to meet individual needs of students.
7. New recognition of the need for creative approaches toward multilingual and multicultural education in our pluralistic society.
8. Reform movements to bring about more effective integration rather than mere desegregation of schools.

The major point that I have been attempting to make is that as school leaders and others recognize our mutual self-interest in dealing in positive forms with student unrest and disruption rather than merely trying to suppress it, new and better means of delivering education will result. When we find ourselves acting positively, affirmatively, and constructively in responding to the challenges of school disruption, all of us will benefit.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE
DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Recorder's Form

Session: 2 **Recorder:** Judy Whittemore

Group: C

A. Issues Raised By Consultant v/w the Group

1. Although we are under going many social changes, the school organization is still relying on traditional ways of dealing with student process.
2. Open up all curricula to all students.
3. Recent court ruling emphasizing due process and personal liability may cause us to examine our practices.
4. Evaluation were distinction between detention centers and alternation program.
5. School attending the student rather than opposite/compulsory attendance emphasis.
6. Block teacher/pupil rates—concern for bid that there are fewer and fewer block teachers in classroom.
7. Student bill of rights—any good model?
   (NY Civil Liberties Union)
8. Any studies regarding curriculum and instructions changes at its, level (ie: dept. open ed.) that may be contributing to later problem?

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCAION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE
DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Recorder's Form

Session: II Recorder: Mr. John A. Brown

Group: D Facilitator: Mr. Martin J. Mulderrig, Jr.

I. Topic—Disruptive Youth and Technology

A. Disruptive Youth does not disappear suddenly

B. Disruptive Youth has a beginning and slowly develops over a large period of time

C. What can we do with Disruptive Youth?

1. Identify him at early age and take corrective measures
   They have very early problems and home visitations are of utmost importance
   We must begin career awareness in elementary—Career Experimentation in upper elementary and then help him develop the occupation he wants to enter—Would be work
   In vocational education, we can't use vocation education as a dumping ground.
   You can be sure if he is disruptive in regular program he would be disruptive in vocational—Sometimes in vocational courses he might be motivated and might not.

D. What can we do with students in Vocational course?

1. Find out what is the aspiration level of student
2. Train him toward some type of a job skill
3. Train toward Multi-occupational type of training (cluster of trades)
4. We need to allow students out of school to work on job and then bring them back for further training
5. Need to develop program for the new technology—Don't forget apprentice level or adult training

II. Questions—Facilitator

1. We place too much emphasis on academic courses and not enough on vocational.
2. You don't learn everything in school so give student credit for on-the-job training.
3. Allow some students to take vocational English and vocational mathematics in lieu of regular math and English.

STUDENT RIGHTS

SMALL GROUP PRESENTATION BY:

DR JOHN T. SEYFARTH

Virginia Commonwealth University

School administrators who have anything to do with discipline of students should be aware of two recent decisions of the Supreme Court which bear on the area of student rights. The decisions are separated in time by six years; nonetheless, they are part of a trend, which is continuing, to grant children substantially the same rights as adults.

In 1969 in Tinker v. Des Moines, the court held that the First Amendment, right of free speech, extends to children in school. That right might be infringed—the Court said—only if, in exercising it, students "materially and substantially" interfere with the operations of the school.

The Court said: "In our system, state-operated schools may not be enclaves of totalitarianism. School officials do not possess absolute authority over their students. Students in schools as well as out of school . . . are possessed of fundamental rights which the State must respect, just as they themselves must respect their obligations to the State."

The meaning of material and substantial disruption was clarified somewhat by later decision. The time, location and manner of students' exercise of free speech may be considered in deciding whether restraint is justified, but the courts have been reluctant to rule that the contest of what students say or write in itself justifies such restraint.

For example, courts have upheld school authorities in the following actions:

- Suspending students who walked out of a school pep rally to protest the playing of "Dixie."
- Suspension of students who stayed out of school for the purpose of holding a rally to protest school policies which they claimed were discriminatory.
- Suspending students who held a sit-in in a school hallway.
- Prohibiting all demonstrators inside school buildings.

But the courts have generally found for students in cases involving the content of students' speech:

- A federal court held that a school policy which prevented a student from distributing leaflets in support of a partisan political candidate violated the student's First Amendment rights.
- A federal court held that a policy which prohibited students from publishing statements which advocated disobeying school rules was unconstitutional.
- Another federal court overruled a board policy which prohibited distribution of any statement which was "grossly insulting" to an individual or group, or which advocated illegal acts.
- Two federal appeals courts have ruled that school officials may not require prior approval of literature for distribution by and to students.

The second important decision was handed down in January, 1975, and it dealt with procedural due process. In Goss v. Lopez, the Court held that a student who is suspended from school has the right to minimal due process guarantees. These include notice of reasons and a hearing at which the student at his request must be informed of the nature of the evidence against him. Lopez dealt only with suspensions of ten days or less. For periods exceeding ten days it is possible that additional requirements will be established.

For the most part, schools are in compliance with the procedural rules established by the Court in Lopez. School officials are probably most vulnerable when a suspension is for an indeterminate length of time or when one teacher excludes a child from a class because of misbehavior or failure to complete an assignment.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Recorder's Form

Session: 3 Recorder: Mr. Mack Benn

Group: A Facilitator: Mr. Homer L. Hines

Dr. Seyfarth began by suggesting to administrators who have anything to do with discipline of students to be aware of two recent decisions of the Supreme Court which bear on the area of student rights.

In 1969 in Tinker v. Des Moines, the court held that the First Amendment right of free speech extends to children in school. The court said: "In our system, state-operated schools may not be enclaves of totalitarianism. School officials do not possess absolute authority over their students. Students in school as well as out of school . . . are possessed of fundamental rights which the State must respect their obligations to the State."

The second important decision was handed down in January, 1975, and it dealt with procedural process. In Goss v. Lopez, the court held that a student who is suspended from school has the right to minimal due process guarantees. These include notice of reasons and a hearing at which the student at his request must be informed of the nature of the evidence against him.

Discussion from the group centered around the two previously mentioned cases. As well as the Buckley Amendment concerning student records. Questions were also raised on the legal method of searching student lockers.

It was suggested that administrators become familiar with the recent court decisions and provide in-service training for teachers for the same.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Recorder's Form

Session: 3 Recorder: J. C. Baker

Group: B Facilitator: Rick Miller

A. Issues Raised by the Group

1. Supreme Court decisions on "due process," and the liability of school board and right to sue the school board collectively or individually.
2. What to do with child during process of "due process".
3. Uncertainty over how recent court decisions may affect local school divisions.

B. Points of Agreement Within the Group

1. Va. State laws on suspension and expulsion comply closely with Supreme Court decisions.
2. If the intent is to help the child there may not be problems with decisions of how to handle a child during "due process".

C. Points of Disagreement Within the Group

1. What affect Supreme Court decisions concerning liability of school members, individually, might have on composition of school boards.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Recorder's Form

Session: 3 Recorder: Lois Bradley

Group: C Facilitator: Mrs. Dorothy Meadows

A. Issues Raised By the Group

1. Compulsory attendance
2. Suspensions—need to work for other solutions
3. Fewer suspensions when parents have to bring children
4. Prior knowledge helps parents
5. Probationary system in school
6. Teachers need to know law and children
7. Need to get education—in addition to attendance
8. Suspension to constructive activities would be desirable
9. 18% Public H.S. Have serious protest
10. Authority—rests with legislature
11. Truancy has big effect on becoming delinquent
12. Compulsory attendance: 49 states have laws
    Have to do for good of state—give up certain freedom; police power of state
13. Courts looking at rules and regulations and their reasonableness
14. Education now considered as right rather than privilege
15. **Balance of interest test**

"THE EYE OF THE BEHOLDER"

SMALL GROUP PRESENTATION BY:

MRS. CAROLYNNE H. STEVENS

Assistant Director

Division of Youth Services

Virginia Department of Corrections

I can't count the number of times someone has assigned me a topic like "Characteristics of Delinquents".

Ten or twelve years ago I could have given a pretty coherent talk on that topic.

Now I can't.

I have decided that anyone who works with delinquents should be required to recite daily the 18th verse of the 1st Chapter of Ecclesiastes:

> "For in much wisdom is much grief; and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow."

I can no more intelligently describe the characteristics of delinquents than you can accurately describe the characteristics of a salad. In both instances, the classification is so broad that it tells nothing.

I could spend my few minutes up here reciting a few facts and pseudo-facts—like:

> Males and blacks are over-represented in commitments.
>
> Delinquents tend to be school failures.
>
> Most kids have done something for which court action could have been taken.
>
> About 15% of Virginia's committed delinquents are retarded; about 10% have made one or more serious suicide attempts or gestures; etc., etc., etc.

But I'd rather spend my time directing the group's attention away from delinquents and onto themselves.

For, in truth, delinquency—unlike appendicitis which would exist and be the same anywhere—is delinquency only as the laws and norms of the community say it is. Delinquency is all the behavior a community will not tolerate for a lot of different reasons: concern for safety of life and property, for the presumed welfare of the child, for appropriate social conduct, etc.

And as soon as we acknowledge that delinquency is not a clinical syndrome but norm deviance, oftentimes from a kind of mythical norm, we should begin to be very cautious about looking for much help from broadly applied medical models of cause and of intervention.

If we are going to do anything about delinquency, it seems to me that we are going to have to be willing to change what we do as well as how we do it.

I think it is generally accepted that a society has a right to establish certain ground rules about individual behavior to assure the survival of the society. The individual's compliance with those ground rules is based on such factors as the strength of his felt membership, the clarity and consistency with which the behavioral requirement is perceived, the rewards and punishments both the individual and society attach to the conformity, and the extent of control the individual has over the behavior at any point in time.

With deviance involving this kind of constant interaction between the individual and the society, it is clear that we have to study more than just the ones who are deviating.

If we really want to do something about "disruptive" students, we cannot look for simplistic solutions. We must begin by learning to ask a whole series of questions to try to break the problem

down into manageable pieces:

- What exactly are the disruptive behaviors? By whose standards are they disruptive?
- Who does and who does not display these behaviors?
- When, where, with whom, and for whom does the behavior occur; and . . . not occur?
- What sustains the behavior, i.e. what needs does it meet or what is its pay-off?
- What is the usual punishment? How effective is it? For whom?
- What alternative behavior is desired? By whom?
- What are the rewards or benefits for the desired behavior? To whom?
- Does the student know how and when to perform the desired behavior?
- Etc.

And not until we have gone through a problem definition process like this do we build a rational base to decide whether and how to address the student (or group of similar students), or the curriculum, or the teaching techniques, or the classroom management techniques, or the school policies, or policy enforcement procedures, or the family, or the peer group, or the near neighborhood, or what.

I doubt that we will ever get more than minimal to moderate agreement on what constitutes delinquency because there is so much variance in people's tolerances and interpretations of behavior. What is assault and battery to one may be a boys-will-be-boys fight to another. Maybe one coping measure would be to start teaching the complexities of applied social psychology and social cueing in the primary grades rather than in high school and college, on the premise that "reading" and "speaking", the social environment or cultural language and its various nuances is at least as important to social survival as reading and speaking the verbal language in its formal and informal versions.

I doubt that we will ever so perfect our social institutions that they won't inadvertently damage some children at times. But I think we have to continually re-examine our laws, our policies, our practices, our value systems, and our belief systems to keep that accidental harm exposed and corrected rationally and as best we can. Children often do live up to our expectations, good and bad. And children do get hurt in our social machinery.

I doubt that we will ever prevent all delinquency, or serious deviance—nor cure all of it that will occur. But we have to try to deal with the specific deviance and with the specific deviant quite specifically. This means gearing up to provide a continuum of differential services that will stand the best chance of succeeding with each type of deviance. *Example:* three children seriously vandalize a classroom one night. A study of the situation may suggest very different "motives" or attendent problems.

- One is a kid with a learning problem for whom school has become a constant source of failure and hurt and humiliation.
- One is somewhat intoxicated and thrashing around for possible means to stretch the adolescent umbilical cord a bit further.
- One is a somewhat dull and now very frightened youngster who mostly wanted to belong and be accepted tonight and who discovered too late that he had blundered into a situation from which he neither knew whether nor how to extricate himself.

In this particular example we can reasonably assume that practically everybody, including the three children, agrees that this behavior won't be tolerated, i.e. is clearly deviant from expected behavior. (Although it does *not* follow that we can therefore expect the children to feel guilty; they may feel it was justified.) It seems to me that the appropriate corrective measures may be quite different in each case and will also differentially involve others. For example, the first boy clearly cannot fully deal with his problem unless the school takes some primary ownership for the problem

with him. In the case of the other two boys, the school may be able to be of significant but secondary assistance in helping them to find alternative means of meeting their social needs which may currently be interfering with their education.

And finally, to prevent differential intervention from becoming a fancy name for everybody doing his own thing with no accountability, I think we have to begin doing the kind of systematic program planning, implementation, and evaluation that will let us know at any point in time exactly who did what to whom and with what results. Otherwise we will continue to lurch from one hastily conceived notion to another without knowing whether any of it works for anybody.

The school, consisting of both its academic and social aspects, plays different parts in the development of different children's problems. Maybe it isn't fair or reasonable that society seems to expect schools to be all things to all children, but in fact the school is the only more or less universal, more or less organized socialization instrument this society has right now. So, I think it has to be a lot of things to a lot of kids—and the rest of us in the human resource field have to help the schools carry out that charge.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Recorder's Form

Session: 3 Recorder: Clyde Keen

Group: D Facilitator: Pink P. Wimbish

A. Issues Raised By the Group

1. Problems of early identification-danger of Labeling.
2. Schools are asked to do too much. However, it is realized that the school is the only universal institution that can deal with the problems.
3. Some delinquents are probably learning disability cases whose needs were not met in school.
4. We have failed to teach parents "parental skills" which is seen in parents telling courts they cannot handle their children.
5. A child's needs should be met at the local level since this is where the child will be living.
6. Problems of delinquents were present before integration. However, many want to blame integration for delinquents.

B. Points of Agreement Within the Group

1. Society must give schools resources to do the job it expects them to do.
2. Schools get blamed for problems of the delinquent. However, we fail to get the credit due us for the great achievements of many of our students.

C. Comments and/or Recommendations for Action by the Group

1. Some forms of lobbying for more fiancial support should be organized to include all agencies working on the same problem.
2. Home visitations would be good to use in preventing serious problems.

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Wednesday, April 2, 1975

11:00-1:00 General Registration

1:00-3:00 First General Session

Presiding—Dr. V. Wendell Hylton, Director, Technical Assistance Program/Office for School Integration Services

Greetings—Mr. Samuel P. Johnson, Jr., Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

Welcome and Introduction of Speaker—Dr. William H. Cochran, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction

Address—Hon. James B. Spurlock, Jr., Deputy Assistant, Governor's Cabinet

Introduction of Keynote Speaker—Mr. F. Brent Sandidge, Assistant Superintendent of Administration and Finance.

Keynote Presentation—Mr. Leon Hall, Director, School Desegregation Project, Southern Regional Council

Overview—Mr. Shady Clark, Jr., Assistant Supervisor, Technical Assistance Program/Office for School Integration Services

3:00-3:05 Break

3:10-4:10 Phase I—Small Group Sessions

THEME: THE SCHOOL IN RELATION TO DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Group A—Washington Room

Topic—SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS IN RELATION TO DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Ryland Dishner, Assistant Superintendent for Professional and Educational Support Services, State Department of Education

Consultant—Mr. James Anderson, Superintendent, Prince Edward Public Schools

Facilitator—Dr. Lillian P. Jennings, Associate Dean of School of Education, Madison College

Recorder—Mr. William M. Moore, Supervisor, Adult Education, State Department of Education

Group B—Byrd Room

Topic—COUNSELING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES IN RELATION TO DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Introduction of Consultant—Mrs. Hamilton Crockford, Secretary to State Parent Teacher Association.

Consultant—Dr. Rondle Edwards, Assistant Superintendent, Pupil Personnel Services, Richmond City Schools

Facilitator—Mrs. Virginia R. Hogan, Information Officer, Title III, ESEA

Recorder—Mr. Clinton V. Turner, Assistant Supervisor, Agriculture, State Department of Education

Group C—Lee Room

Topic—DISRUPTIVE YOUTH AND SCHOOL CLUBS AND CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. James Taylor, Assistant Superintendent, Lynchburg Public Schools

Consultant—Mr. Julian Moore, Director of Pupil Services, Roanoke City Schools

Facilitator—Dr. Frank Cain, Director of Program Evaluation, State Department of Education

Recorder—Mr. Frank Cuthrell, Assistant Principal, Danville Public Schools

Group D—Monroe Room

Topic — EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Wayland Jones, Director of Teacher Certification, State Department of Education

Consultant—Dr. Jean A. Moorefield, Assistant Supervisor, Office for School Integration Services

Facilitator—Mrs. Laverne Smith, Assistant Supervisor, Elementary Education, State Department of Education

Recorder—Mr. Thomas M. Lewis, Guidance Counselor, Bowling Green Junior High School, Caroline County Public Schools

4:15-4:30 First General Assembly Continued
Phase I, Small Group Reports

Recorder—Group A
Recorder—Group B
Recorder—Group C
Recorder—Group D

4:30-6:00 Dinner

6:00-7:25 Secondary General Assembly

Introduction of Speaker—Mrs. Florence Bailey Assistant Supervisor for Business Education, State Department of Education

Keynote Address—Mr. George C. Guilliams, Special Programs Coordinator, Montgomery County Public Schools

Slide Presentation on Project ARTS—(alternate route to school)—Mr. Ferguson Meadows, Head Counselor

7:30-8:30 Phase II—Small Group Sessions

THEME: SOCIETY IN RELATION TO DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Group A—Washington Room

Topic—THE COMMUNITY AND THE DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Don Ayers, Assistant Supervisor of Guidance, State Department of Education

Consultant—Mr. William A. Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Administration, Chesapeake Public Schools

Facilitator—Col. Francis T. Phillips Jr., Supervisor of Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III, State Department of Education

Recorder—Mr. Dale Robinson, Director of Planning, State Department of Education

Group B—Byrd Room

Topic—THE CHANGING STUDENT MORES

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Shady Clark, Jr., Assistant Supervisor, State Department of Education/Technical Assistant Program

Consultant—Dr. Robert T. Frossard, Area Director, Richmond City Public Schools

Facilitator—Richard L. Chubb, Principal, Roanoke City Schools

Recorder—Mr. Ronnie G. Bognar, Assistant Principal, Winchester City Public Schools

Group C—Lee Room

Topic—DISRUPTIVE YOUTH AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Thomas Elliott, Assistant Supervisor, Social Studies, State Department of Education

Consultant—Dr. Boyd Bosma, Director of Civil Liberties and Intergroup Relations, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.

Facilitator—Mrs. Dorothy M. Meadows, Counselor, Richmond Public Schools

Recorder—Mrs. Judith Whittemore, Director of Instruction, Powhatan Public Schools

Group D—Monroe Room

Topic—DISRUPTIVE YOUTH AND TECHNOLOGY

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Shirley Boothe, Director of Federal Programs, Norfolk City Schools

Consultant—Mr. William Vaughan, Division of Vocational Education, State Department of Education

Facilitator—Mr. Martin J. Mulderrig, Jr., Supervisor, Pupil Personnel Services, Virginia Beach City Public Schools

Recorder—Mr. John A. Brown, Principal, Buckingham County Schools

8:35-8:50 Second General Assembly

Phase II—Small Group Reports

Recorder—Group A
Recorder—Group B
Recorder—Group C
Recorder—Group D

Thursday, April 3, 1975

8:00- 9:00 Late Registration

9:00-10:00 Third General Assembly

Presiding—Dr. Jean A. Moorefield, Assistant Supervisor for Testing, Technical Assistance Program/Office for School Integration Services

Introduction of Speakers and Remarks—Mr. Harry Smith, Special Assistant, Public Information and Communications

Address—Mr. Roy N. Puckett, Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce and Resources, Governor's Cabinet

Keynote Presentation—Mr. Justin F. McNeill, Program Officer, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

10:00-10:30 Question and Answer Period

10:30-11:30 Phase II—Small Group Sessions

THEME: LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Group A—Washington Room

Topic—THE SCHOOL, COMMUNITY AND STUDENT RIGHTS

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Russell Bush, Director of Federal Programs, Richmond City Schools

Consultant—Dr. John Seyfarth, Assistant Professor of Education, Leadership and Personal Development, Virginia Commonwealth University

Facilitator—Mr. Homer L. Hines, Supervisor of Federal Programs, Newport News City Public Schools

Recorder—Mr. Mack Benn, Coordinator of Public Personnel Services, Suffolk City Schools

Group B—Byrd Room

Topic—FEDERAL LEGISLATION CONCERNING THE DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Charlie Conyers, Supervisor, Migrant Education, State Department of Education

Consultant—Dr. Robert Turner, Director of Federal Programs, State Department of Education

Facilitator—Mr. Rick Miller, Staff Specialist, Consultative Resource Center, University of Virginia, Charlottesville

Recorder—Mr. Josephine C. Baker, Assistant Supervisor, Mathematics, State Department of Education

Group C—Lee Room

Topic—STATE LEGISLATURE CONCERNING THE DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Vernon Wildy, Supervisor, Evaluation and Planning, State Department of Education

Consultant—Dr. David Alexander, Assistant Professor of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Facilitator—Mr. Henry O. Hollimon, Assistant Principal, Charles City County Public Schools

Recorder—Mrs. Lois Bradley, Director of ESAA Programs, Richmond Public Schools

Group D—Monroe Room

Topic—THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT, IDENTIFICATION AND CHARACTERISTICS

Introduction of Consultant—Mr. Elmo Rainey, Assistant Superintendent, Petersburg Public Schools

Consultant—Mrs. Carolyne Stevens, Division of Youth Services, Diagnostic Center, Richmond

Facilitator—Mr. Pink P. Wimbish, Principal, Brunswick County Public Schools

Recorder—Mr. Clyde Keen, Principal, Lexington City Public Schools

11:35-11:50 Third General Assembly Continued

Phase III—Small Group Reports

Recorder—Group A

Recorder—Group B

Recorder—Group C

Recorder—Group D

12:00-1:45 Lunch

2:00-3:15 Fourth General Assembly

Presiding and Introduction of Panel—Mr. Howard J. Ramagli, Jr., Assistant Supervisor, Technical Assistance Program, Office for School Integration Services

Moderator—Dr. V. Wendell Hylton, Director, Technical Assistance Program, Office for School Integration Services

3:15-3:30 Lecturette and Closing Remarks—Dr. V. Wendell Hylton, Director, Technical Assistant Program/Office for School Integration Services

APPENDIX B

List of Participants

(Registered for Conference)

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
Audree S. Alexander	Arlington County Schools	Home-School Liason
David Alexander	VPI & SU	Assistant Professor
John G. Alexander	Willard Jr. High School	Head
Frances Anderson	Powhatan-Goochland Community Action Agency	Counselor
Grace I. Anderson	Powhatan-Goochland Community Action Agency	Project Coordinator
James M. Anderson, Jr.	Prince Edward County	Division Superintendent
A. Austin	Roanoke City (Fleming High)	Assistant Principal
Florence G. Bailey	State Dept. of Education	Assistant State Supervisor
Josephine Baker	State Dept. of Education	Assistant Supervisor of Math
W. Lester Banks	Va. State Conference-NAACP	Executive Secretary
David J. Battle	Henderson Middle School (Richmond)	Administrative Dean
(Mrs.) Barbara W. Beale	Ladysmith High School (Caroline)	Guidance Counselor
L. Alvin Beamon	Westmoreland County School Board	Director of Instruction
Robert A. Belyea	Shenandoah County	School Psychologist
Mack Benn, Jr.	Suffolk City Schools	Coordinator of Pupil Personnel Service
Dr. Edward P. Best	Caroline County Schools	Psychologist
Joan M. Bloomer	Nelson Junior High School	Assistant Principal
William J. Bloomer	Nelson Co. High School	Principal
Shirley D. Boothe	Norfolk City Schools	Director—Office of Special Projects
Dr. Boyd Bosma	NEA (Teacher Rights Division)	Director—Civil Liberties and Intergroup Relations

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
Jack R. Bowdre	Danville Public Schools (TMC)	School Psychologist
Lois L. Bradley	Richmond Public Schools	Director—ESAA
Dr. Morton Bradman	Henrico County	Assistant Superintendent
Mrs. Dale Brittle	Bowling Green Senior High	Guidance Counselor
James A. Brinkley, Jr.	Graves Middle School—Richmond	Principal
Brenda J. Brokaw	Williamsburg Schools	School Psychologist
Frank Brothers	Indian River Junior High School—Chesapeake City	Assistant Principal
Francis Brown	Total Action Against Poverty	Coordinator—Youth Programs
John A. Brown	Buckingham Junior High	Principal
Theresa B. Brown	Powhatan-Goochland Community Action Agency (ESSA II)	Early Childhood Teacher
Jean Bruce	Health-Welfare Planning Council	Director, ESAA Project
William P. Brunson	Norfolk City Schools	Head Counselor
Ronnie G. Bugnar	Handley High School, Winchester	Assistant Principal
R. Gerald Burton	Brunswick Jr. High School	Assistant Principal
Donald C. Burriesci	State Division Youth Services	Delinquency Prevention Consultant
Russell M. Busch	Richmond Public Schools	Director of Federal Programs
Frank Cain	State Dept. of Education	Director of Program Evaluation
(Mrs.) H. G. Carter	Prince Edward Elementary	Guidance Counselor
Bessie L. Cauthorne	Civic Organization	Attendance—Aide
C. B. Chandler	Wythe County	Superintendent
Richard L. Chubb	Hurt Park School—Roanoke	Principal
John M. Clark	Bedford County Public Schools	Visiting Teacher

66

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
William C. Coates	Smith High—Chesapeake	Assistant Principal
Dr. William H. Cochran	State Dept. of Education	Acting Superintendent
Willie J. Conyers	Fredericksburg City Schools	Supervisor, Special Services
Dr. Bernard A. Cogan	Brunswick Public Schools	School Psychologist
C. L. Conyers	State Dept. of Education	Supervisor, Title I and Migrant Education
Kathryn G. Cook	Arlington Public Schools	Supervisor of Guidance
Cassandra Courtney	Middlesex County School Board	Federal Project Director
Georgia Cox	Montgomery County	Visiting Teacher
Robert Crews	Page County School Board	Director, Special Programs
Mrs. W. H. Crockford	School-Court Task Force	Chairman
Dennis Custis	Onancock High—Accomack	Assistant Principal
Frank Cuthrell	Langston Junior High—Danville	Assistant Principal
Virginia L. Dalton	Virginia Education Association	Director of Instr. Services
James H. Daughtridge	Cave Spring High School	Principal
David A. Depp	Henrico Schools	Social Worker
Gregory A. Diel	Ressel County School Board	Attendance Officer
Clyde O. Dillard	Henry County Schools	Supervisor
John M. Diller	Roanoke City Schools Technical Assistance Program	Project Leader
Tom Doland	Chesterfield County	School Psychologist
Chas. F. Duff	Walker-Grant (Fredericksburg)	Principal
Rita Duncan	Division of Youth Services	Delinquency Prevention Consultant
Robert L. Duncan	Giles County Public Schools	Superintendent

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
Lloyd Eason	Dozier Intermediate—Newport News	Assistant Principal
Rondle E. Edwards	Richmond Public Schools	Assistant Superintendent
Thomas A. Elliott	Va. State Dept. of Education	Assistant Supervisor
Lorraine Eastman Fava	Norfolk City Schools	School Psychologist
Berny Ferrill	Botetourt County Public Schools	Principal
Gwen Firek	Winchester City Schools	School Psychologist
A. K. Fisher	Accomack County	Assistant Superintendent
T. A. Fleetwood	Paige County	Principal
Wayne D. Flint	Parry McCluer High	Assistant Principal
Dr. Robert T. Frossard	Richmond City	Area Director
Eugene M. Gallaher	Pittsylvania County	Assistant Superintendent Instruction
William Ross Gardner, Jr.	Floyd County School Board	Visiting Teacher— Title I Coordinator
Mack George	Patrick County High	Counselor
Adelaide H. Gittins	Arlington-Gunston Jr. High	Guidance Director
Brenda Glenn	Arlington Public Schools	Assistant Principal
D. H. Goshorn, Jr.	Bedford County Schools	School Psychologist
Floyd L. Gravitt	Arlington Public Schools	Coordinator
Cora Gray	Powhatan-Goochland Community Action Agency	SWE Counselor
McClelland M. Gray	Augusta County	Director of Planning
Pamela K. Grubb	Russel County Public Schools	Guidance Counselor
George Guilliams	Montgomery County Schools	Special Programs Coordinator
Albert L. Guy	Thomas Jefferson Junior High Arlington County	Assistant Principal

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
Leon W. Hall	Southern Regional Council	Program Director
Rosanne J. Hammes	James City County Public Schools—Williamsburg	Director—Pupil Personnel Services
E. Alphonzo Harrell	Chesapeake Schools	Assistant Principal
Emma L. Harrington	Norfolk Public Schools	Visiting Teacher
James R. Harris	Dale City Elem.—Prince William	Principal
Dr. Jan Harris	Longwood College	Assoc. Dean of Students
John D. Harris	North Accomack	Assistant Principal
R. E. Harvey	Dept. H.E.W., Officer for Civil Rights Higher Education Branch Philadelphia, PA	Chief, Higher Ed. Branch OCR Region II
Betty Hawa	Division of State Planning Education Section	Educational Planner
James K. Hiatt	Patrick County High School	Principal
Laura L. Hickman	King & Queen Civic Association	Project Director
Homer L. Hines	Newport News Public Schools	Supervisor, Federal Programs
Mrs. Virginia R. Hogan	State Dept. of Education	Public Information Officer Title III
Thomas Hooker	Dinwiddie County Jr. High	Assistant Principal
Mrs. Helen P. Howard	Virginia Ave. Elem.—Petersburg	Teacher-State Youth Advisor
Ruby M. Hoyt	Health-Welfare-Recreation Planning Council	Discussion Leader
Nikki Y. Isherwood	Winchester City School System	Teacher
Marguerite Jackson	Bowling Green Sr. High—Caroline	Counselor
Sibbie C. Jenkins (Ms.)	Westmoreland County	Librarian
Dr. Lillian Jennings	Madison College	Assistant Dean
Claiborne R. Johnson	Gold Hill Elem.—Buckingham	Principal

69

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
Jacob L. Johnson	Winchester City Public Schools	Superintendent
S. P. Johnson	State Dept. of Education	Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
W. A. Johnson	Chesapeake Public Schools	Assistant Superintendent
Gilbert L. Jones	Walker-Grant Middle School Fredericksburg	Assistant Principal
Wayland Jones	State Dept. of Education	Director, Teacher Education
Ronald J. Jordan	William Ruffner—Roanoke City	Teacher
Mrs. Elouise B. Kearney	Norfolk City School Board	Visiting Teacher
Clyde E. Keen	Waddell Elem.—Lexington City	Elementary Principal
Ben Kendall	O.T. Bonner Jr. High—Danville	Assistant Principal
G. M. Kerriger	Rehabilitative School Authority	Principal
Ken Lowalski	VA Association of School Executives—Charlottesville	Executive Secretary
Cornelia Laban	Richard Bland College	Biology
Tom Lewis	Bowling Green Jr. High—Caroline	Guidance Counselor
Phillip R. Lindsey	Falls Church City Schools	Guidance Director
Mrs. Shirley Little	Norfolk Public Schools	School Psychologist
Sam Lucas	Auburn High—Montgomery Co.	Principal
Doug Magann	University of Virginia	Grad Student/Instructor
Dorothy P. Malcolm	Powhatan—Goochland Community Action Agency	Tutor Coordinator
Dr. Robert R. Marks	Greensville County	Assistant Superintendent
Dr. Joseph M. Mayfield	Henrico County Schools	School Psychologist
Albert E. McCue	Westmoreland Co. Washington and Lee High School	Principal

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
Shirley H. McDaniel	Buckingham Co. High School	Guidance Director
Roena McJunkin	Warwick High—Newport News	Counselor
Patricia McLaurin	Middlesex County	Pupil Service Coordinator
Justin F. McNeill	Equal Educational Opportunities	Program Officer
John D. Meade	Petersburg City	Superintendent
Ferguson B. Meadows, Jr.	Montgomery County Schools	Counselor
Foster Miles, Jr.	State Dept. of Education	Assistant State Supervisor
Frank L. Miller	Montgomery County	School Psychologist
Rick Miller	University of Virginia	Staff Specialist
Willis C. Milton	Rural Retreat High School Wythe County	Principal
Pauline A. Mitchell	WCVE/ Channel 23 TV	Assistant to Program Director
Julian R. Moore	Russell County Schools	School Psychologist
Judy F. Molinary	Roanoke City Schools	Director-Pupil Personnel Services
William G. Moosha	Va. Beach City Schools	Assistant Principal
Martin J. Mulderrig, Jr.	Virginia Beach City Pub. School	Supervisor, Pupil Personnel Services
Kenneth L. Neathery	Danville Community College	Dean of Student Services
Beth C. Nelson	VEA	President
Mrs. Maggie S. Nelson	State Dept. of Education	Supervisor
Tom Northen	Department of Corrections Division of Youth Services	Delinquency Prevention Specialist
Shade J. Palmer	James Blair School Williamsburg-James City Co.	Principal
Donald A. Peccia	Virginia Beach Junior High	Assistant Principal for Administration

71

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
John K. Pegues	Fauquier County Public Schools Marshall Junior High School	Guidance Director
Clarence P. Penn	Prince Edward	Principal
Mrs. LaVerne R. Pervall	Prince Edward Co. Public School	Home-School Coordinator
W. Clinton Pettus	Virginia State College	Assistant Professor
Jack H. Pettyjohn	Augusta County Schools	School Psychologist
Jude Phelps	John Tyler Community College	Counselor
Carl Plum	Central High—Shenandoah Co.	Principal
Ben Price	Suffolk	School Psychologist
E. Richard Price	Fredericksburg City Schools James Monroe High School	Assistant Principal
J. Preston Ragsdale	Beaumont Learning Center	Principal
Elmore E. Rainey	Petersburg Administration Office	Assistant Superintedent
Horace R. Rice	Bedford County Schools	Guidance Counselor
Curtis A. Richardson	Danville Public Schools	Administrative Assistant to Superintendent
Dale G. Robinson	State Dept. of Education	Director (Planning)
Melvin D. Robertson	Charles City	Assistant Principal
Donald C. Robinson	Special Services Division Brunswick	Director of Special Services
F. Brent Sandidge	State Dept. of Education	Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance
W. R. Savage, Jr.	Suffolk City	Assoc.—Superintendent
Philip M. Secrist, Jr.	Page County High	Principal
Paula Renee Setzer	Youth/College Division-NAACP	Administrative Assistant to State Youth President
John T. Seyfarth	Virginia Commonwealth Univ.	Assistant Professor

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
Patrick J. Sherman	Liberty High—Bedford Co.	Assistant Principal
Callie P. Shingleton	State Dept. of Education	Superintendent of Elem. Ed.
Richard W. Sidebottom	Goochland County	School Psychologist
Barbara A. Slayden	Rehabilitative School Authority Reception and Diagnostic Center	Acting Principal
Cynthia D. Smith	Department of Mental Health—Mental Retardation	Assistant Director of Mental Retardation
Fred B. Smith	Richmond Public Schools	Supervisor
Harry L. Smith	State Dept. of Education	Special Assistant, Public Information and Publications
LaVerne B. Smith	State Dept. of Education	Assistant Supervisor—Language Arts
Mildred B. Spencer (Mrs.)	Hampton Institute	Acting Director
Charles T. Spurlock, Jr.	East End Middle School—Richmond	Principal
James B. Spurlock, Jr.	Governor's Cabinet	Deputy Assistant
Donnalee Steele	Va. Community Development Org.	
Diane L. Stellrecht	Boutetourt County Schools	School Psychologist
Carolynne Stevens	Department of Corrections Division of Youth Services	Assistant Director Clinical and Prevention
Robert L. Stokes	State Dept. of Education	Assistant Supervisor of Ed.
Philip B. Tankard	Accomack County	Division Superintendent
James H. Taylor	Lynchburg Public Schools	Assistant Superintendent
Beth Thomas	Commonwealth Girl Scouts Mid-Virginia	Field Director
Delores B. Thomas	Maryland State Department	Specialist
Jayne A. Thomas	Total Action Against Poverty	Director
Marshall O. S. Thomas	Winchester City Schools	Guidance Counselor

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
Elnora F. Thompkins	A. T. Johnson Junior High Westmoreland County	Guidance Counselor
Joseph A. Tompkins	A. T. Johnson Junior High Westmoreland County	Guidance Counselor
Charles E. Turner	Southampton Co. School Board	Administrative Assistant
Clinton V. Turner	State Dept. of Education	Assistant Supervisor of Agricultural Education
W. S. Turner	Pittyslvania High School Board	Assistant Superintendent
James A. Tuthill	Kempsville High School Va. Beach City Public Schools	Assistant Principal Administration
Shirley R. Van Dresser	Montgomery County Schools	Counselor
R. Bruce Walker	Norfolk City Schools	Counselor
Conley E. Wallace	Staunton River High School Bedford County	Assistant Principal
Thomas Washington	Buckingham	Assistant Principal
Dr. William Gene Watson	Roanoke City Schools	Chief Psychologist
Mrs. Geneva Webb	Henrico County Schools	Guidance Counselor
William L. Whitley	Suffolk City Public Schools	Principal
Judith D. Whithmore	Powhatan County Public Schools	Director of Instruction
Vernon Wildy	State Dept. of Education	Supervisor, Evaluation and Training
Vivian Williamson	State Dept. of Education	Assistant Supervisor
Edwin F. Wilson	George Wythe High School Wythe County	Sec. Principal
Pink P. Wimbish	Brunswick Junior High School	Principal
Morris W. Witten	Wythe County Schools	Administrative Assistant
Clifton A. Wood	Crestwood Junior High School Chesapeake	Principal

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	*School Division or Organization*	*Position*
Pauline A. Word	Buckingham County Junior High	Guidance Counselor
James D. Worley	Giles County	Visiting Teacher
Phyllis B. Worrell	Fauquier County	Visiting Teacher
Kirby Wright	Central Office Staff Pittsylvania County Schools	Visiting Teacher
Larry A. Yatchum	Lexington	School Social Worker

APPENDIX C

CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM AND SUMMARY DATA

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Conference Evaluation

Frequency Distribution and Mean Rating

Item Number	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*Mean Rating*
1.	13	15	23	3	1	2.345
2.	17	19	9	8	4	2.354
3.	5	4	6	2	2	2.579
4.	3	4	9	4	—	2.700
5.	3	5	2	1	1	2.333
6.	4	8	6	2	—	2.300
7.	12	21	8	5	2	2.250
8.	14	20	7	6	—	2.106
9.	2	5	6	—	—	2.308
10.	1	8	5	1	2	2.706
11.	3	3	3	—	2	2.545
12.	—	7	5	2	1	2.800
13.	15	21	15	5	1	2.228
14.	18	15	16	7	3	2.356
15.	8	7	2	—	1	1.833
16.	4	5	3	1	—	2.077
17.	5	8	1	1	—	1.867
18.	10	4	4	2	—	1.900
19.	11	7	5	—	1	1.875
20.	4	3	2	5	—	2.571

Overall Mean Rating—2.307

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE
DISRUPTIVE YOUTH

Summary Data

Strengths of the Conference

1. Well organized.
2. Speakers knowledgeable in their field. (6)
3. Structure of conference good. (3)
4. Physical facilities excellent.
5. The concerns.
6. Sufficient multiplicity of small topics related to the subject.
7. Kept conference on time. (8)
8. Freedom to change groups and hear others talk.
9. Small group discussions. (7)
10. Well qualified speakers, facilitators, and recorders. (3)
11. Regular and systematic reporting (out) from small groups. (7)
12. Speakers well planned and prepared. (2)
13. Well selected resource and consultant personnel. (6)
14. Participants represent large segment of the people.
15. Varied input.
16. Excellent leadership of those who organized the conference.
17. The fact that the first step has been taken is outstanding in that a great deal of discussion will result.
18. Good speeches. (2)
19. Good discussions.
20. Some specifics from Montgomery County (slide presentation). (5)
21. Excellent cross-section of speakers and persons attending. (6)
22. Diversity of problems and ideas.
23. Many problems brought out.
24. All divisions seem to be experiencing some problems.
25. Excellent for dissemination of information.
26. Cordiality.
27. Well presented.
28. Concerned participants. (2)
29. Wealth of information from all levels. (2)
30. It was the best conference I've had the pleasure to attend.
31. Recognition of problems and the idea of doing something about the problems. (3)
32. New insights and ideas exchanged. (3)
33. Possible alternative programs discussed.
34. Discussion of points of law based on legislation and recent court decisions.
35. Information on recent research.
36. Topics focused on in relation to disruptive youth.
37. Became aware of some of the problems that I did not realize even existed in schools.
38. Very informative discussion—practical approaches.
39. Handout information which should be of value for follow-up study and for activities in local communities. (2)
40. Enjoyed meeting new people and some old friends.
41. Variety of approach: Lecture, small discussion groups.
42. Variety of backgrounds of speakers. (2)
43. Openness of communications.

44. Very timely occasion.
45. Increased awareness and communication.
46. Created a sense of working together to help these students.
47. Ideal size—little wasted time.

Weaknesses of the Conference

1. Dinner hour poorly planned—too early and too short. (2)
2. Lengthy, detailed introductions unnecessary. (2)
3. Groups too large to really promote participation (interaction). (3)
4. Small groups needed more dynamic leadership.
5. Topic too broad (and too general). (4)
6. Lack of concrete programs toward resolving the problems.
7. No social hour. (2)
8. Changes in participants. (2)
9. The causes and possible cures of disruptive youth was not discussed enough. (2)
10. Too many lectures. (3)
11. Not enough specifics. (5)
12. Too much misdirected discussion. (3)
13. Too few solutions (techniques, methods). (4)
14. More time for group interaction. (3)
15. Too much time devoted to platform speakers.
16. Inability to get into more groups.
17. Should be no night session. (2)
18. Much talk but very few solutions.
19. Starting time should begin earlier on first day.
20. An assumption was made that disruptive youth are black, but are not, but we have problems.
21. Pace of speakers and group meeting too accelerated.
22. Tried to do too much on first day.
23. Need more suggestions for more alternative programs. (3)
24. How to develop alternative methods or choices to provide youth.
25. How to involve parent and community in giving direction and help.
26. Too many activities scheduled for the short period.
27. Not enough classroom teachers involved.
28. Clearer definitions were needed.
29. Too much time pressure on keynote address speakers.
30. Too urban oriented.
31. Too ethnic oriented.
32. Lack of large urban representation.
33. Too many speakers from State Department. (2)
34. Most of the presentations did not deal with the stated topic. (4)
35. Not enough parents.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
OFFICE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

STATE CONFERENCE

DISRUPTIVE YOUTH
Comments and Recommendations

1. Change grouping to all for *new* exchange of ideas.
2. Set up smaller additional groups.
3. Will it end here?
4. Follow-up sessions should be held in each area in the state. (2)
5. Sessions not exceeding 25 persons is best for discussions.
6. Smaller groups. (2)
7. Evaluation of our local school divisions to help us pinpoint the type of desegregation problems which exist (pushouts, suspensions, dropouts or human relations, etc.).
8. Published conference results or proceedings sent out as soon as possible for intervention while the enthusiasm lasts.
9. Define the topic specifically.
10. Involve more people presently in pubic schools as consultants.
11. More workshop-type approaches dealing with techniques and methods that are successfull.
12. Include a social hour. (3)
13. Follow up with a workshop more teacher oriented.
14. Continued area workshops.
15. Continued state conferences.
16. Involve probation officers and people from social services.
17. Discuss in more detail the causes and what long-range plans might be made to help cure the cause.
18. Discuss more programs that might help deal with current disruptive youth such as alternative schools. (5)
19. Send out questionnaires to participants prior to conference and get ideas on what participants feel important to discuss.
20. Take conference or workshops to localities for teachers.
21. Follow-up conference for administrators.
22. More local contributions as to programs offered.
23. Have more superintendents as speakers.
24. More small group discussions.
25. More presentations of programs being attempted. (4)
26. Regional rather than statewide conferences.
27. Recommend that this type of activity be continued in the future at least on a yearly basis and at best semi-yearly.
28. Seminar on spotting new and old teachers who cause problems for disruptive youth.
29. Seminar on students' rights.
30. Explanation of laws directly affecting our schools.
31. Same type activity for classroom teachers. (2)
32. Conference should start earlier and proceed slower. (2)
33. Do not schedule night conferences. (3)
34. More time allowed for small groups. (4)
35. Invite directors of teacher training programs (colleges) to attend.
36. Involve teachers who are in need of special help along with inservice training directors, as participants in conference sessions.
37. Reshuffle names for each small group session in order to have broader exposure to different thoughts from different people. (3)

38. Should face problems head-on in small group sessions.

39. Standards, which schools should be able to expect, was not discussed.

40. The ESAA Project Coordinators (non-profit and LEA) should be given an opportunity to discuss their activities which they are implementing with students and preschoolers.

41. Involve teachers, parents, community leaders, and students as participants. (5)

42. Include some disruptive youth—let them tell us.

43. Provide models for rural problem children.

44. Separate administrators, counselors, etc. to learn and exchange techniques on handling disruptive youth.

45. Use conference as a springboard to further study the problem.

46. Follow-up to each school division.

47. The way the small groups were organized were much better than the conference last year.

48. Some attention to hospitality.